

OLIN
BS
2575
.G74x
1894a
+

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

The Robert M. and Laura Lee Lintz
Book Endowment for the Humanities

Class of 1924

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 096 083 575



The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924096083575>

The Oracles of Matthew According to Papias

THE
ORACLES ASCRIBED TO MATTHEW
BY
PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS

*A CONTRIBUTION TO
THE CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT*

WITH APPENDICES ON THE
AUTHORSHIP OF THE DE VITA CONTEMPLATIVA,
THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION, AND THE DATE OF THE
MARTYRDOM OF POLYCARP

LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16th STREET
1894

All rights reserved

PREFACE

THE following monograph is a contribution to the criticism of the New Testament. The views put forward in it are shortly these. That the famous work, *Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*, by Papias of Hierapolis, about which so much has been written, was upon the interpretation of Messianic prophecies, and that the work referred to in it, and attributed to Matthew, consisted of a collection of Messianic prophecies in Hebrew, extracted from the Old Testament, and perhaps from other books.

I was led to conclusions which differ so much from those put forward by most critics, in the following way. After reading the argument in the work entitled 'Supernatural Religion,' upon the gospel quotations in Justin Martyr, I was desirous of testing the matter by examining the quotations as they stood in the text of that father. After examining a considerable number of these quotations, I came to the conclusion that while there were many short passages, which, considered by themselves, might well be supposed to have been quoted from the canonical gospels, it was not reasonable to suppose that any of Justin's long quotations came

from the canonical gospels. All of them I have examined exhibit the following peculiarities. They consist of phrases, resembling sometimes one and sometimes another of the canonical gospels, and of other phrases not found in any of them, woven together, so as in each case to form a perfectly coherent whole. No quotation ever follows any one of the canonical gospels consecutively for more than a line or two. There is nothing about the quotations that in the least suggests that they are paraphrased or quoted merely from memory. Between them and the canonical gospels must be interposed the labour of some one who has deliberately cut a text to pieces and rearranged it. It is impossible to suppose that Justin, by merely quoting from the canonical gospels, would have made this mosaic.¹ After examining a consider-

¹ Dr. Sanday has endeavoured to set against this argument the mixed quotations found in the Fathers from the Old Testament. I am disposed, on the other hand, to draw from these mixed quotations the inference that the Fathers quoted the Old Testament in such cases from secondary sources, that is to say, that collections of texts upon particular topics were made either by the persons making the quotations or other authors, and that such collections were the immediate source of the quotations. These mixed quotations are not a probable result of loose citation or of unconscious cerebration. It must be remembered that evidence which is conclusive that the citation, mediately or immediately, is derived from the Old Testament, is not in a parallel case in a writer as old as Justin at all conclusive that an evangelical quotation came from one of the canonical gospels. For, as regards the Old Testament citations, we know that, however devious may have been the road, the Old Testament is the ultimate source of them; but as regards evangelical quotations, on the other hand, we know from internal evidence that the canonical gospels are not original books; in fact, that they are many removes from original books.

The probability, therefore, of an evangelical citation in a writer before the time of Irenaeus coming, not from the canonical gospels, but from some one of the works upon which they are founded, or from some parallel work derived from the same materials, is very great.

able number of gospel quotations, I determined to test Justin's habits of quotation by comparing some of his Old Testament quotations with the LXX. I readily found long quotations which followed the LXX verbatim, sometimes with a various reading or two, through whole chapters. On the other hand, there were short quotations which were very different from the LXX. These latter I noticed to consist of passages explained as Messianic prophecies, some but not all of which were also quoted to a great extent in the same words in Matthew. I hence drew the conclusion that Justin got the Old Testament quotations which did not come from the LXX out of his gospel, and I accounted for those which are not found in any of the canonical gospels, by supposing that his gospel cited more Messianic prophecies than the present canonical gospels do. It was not till some years afterwards that, on reading Davidson's 'Introduction to the New Testament,' I became acquainted with Bleek's analysis of the Old Testament quotations in the synoptic gospels; I was then struck by its agreement with the phenomenon I had noticed in Justin Martyr. Putting the two things together, the explanation suggested itself to me of a work in Aramaic, upon the interpretation of Messianic prophecy, which had been part of the materials out of which the canonical gospels were compiled. Now I had already formed the conclusion that the books attributed by Papias to Matthew and Mark were rather materials out of which the canonical gospels had been partly compiled, than any of those gospels. The consideration, therefore, suggested itself whether this book on Messianic prophecy could be the book written in Hebrew which was attributed by Papias to Matthew.

It was after this that I carefully studied Dr. Lightfoot's essays in the 'Contemporary Review.' I here saw that in all the instances given by him, that were before or not long after the time of Papias, the word *λόγια* was applied to the Old Testament. This suggested to me the interpretation I have maintained in the following essay, and I accordingly set to work to collect all the instances I could of the use of the word, with the result of confirming the suggestion. As I have said, the conclusions I have come to differ from those of most critics, orthodox and unorthodox; but as they are based upon a considerable induction, I have determined to publish them.

I ought to add that I am not under any direct obligation to Credner in respect of the portion of this monograph which deals with the Old Testament quotations from Justin Martyr. I did not become acquainted with the nature of Credner's work until I had well-nigh done, when I learned about it from Dr. Sanday's 'Gospels in the Second Century.' If I had obtained the knowledge earlier I should have endeavoured to avail myself of the assistance which no doubt could have been derived from that source.

February 1894.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY	1
II. THE DATE OF PAPIAS	6
III. JOHN THE ELDER	33
IV. THE VARIOUS READINGS <i>λόγων</i> AND <i>λογίων</i>	45
V. THE MEANING OF THE WORD <i>λόγια</i>	48
VI. THE MEANING OF PAPIAS	82
VII. BLEEK'S ANALYSIS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPELS	129
VIII. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS PARTLY FROM GREEK AND PARTLY FROM ARAMAIC SOURCES	134
IX. SOURCE OF MESSIANIC PROPHECIES COMMON TO MATTHEW AND JUSTIN MARTYR	146
X. SOURCE OF SOME MESSIANIC PROPHECIES IN JUSTIN MARTYR NOT FOUND IN MATTHEW	185
XI. CONCLUSIONS	203
XII. MESSIANIC PROPHECIES NOT FOUND IN CANONICAL BOOKS	206
APPENDIX	
I. REMARKS UPON THE TRANSLATION OF THE FRAGMENT OF PAPIAS RELATING TO MARK	225
II. PLACES IN THE LXX CONTAINING THE WORD <i>λόγιον</i>	227
III. PHILO, THE AUTHOR OF THE 'DE VITA CONTEMPLATIVA'	227

APPENDIX		PAGE
IV.	VARIOUS QUOTATIONS AND RENDERINGS OF ISAIAH XLII. 2-4 .	230
V.	TRANSLATION OF EUSEBIUS'S 'ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,' BOOK III. CAP. 39.	232
VI.	DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS	236
VII.	EXTRACT FROM GEORGE HAMARTOLUS AND NOTE FROM THE CODEX BAROCCIANUS AS TO THE MARTYRDOM OF JOHN .	242
VIII.	EXTRACTS FROM ANASTASIUS OF SINAI	245
IX.	THE NOTICE OF PAPIAS BY JOHN MALALAS	246
X.	EXTRACTS FROM DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE AND MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR	246
XI.	THE DATE OF THE MARTYRDOM OF POLYCARP	247
INDEX		269

THE ORACLES ASCRIBED TO MATTHEW BY PAPIAS OF HIERAPOLIS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

PAPIAS, who, according to Eusebius, was Bishop of Hierapolis in the first decade of the second century, wrote a work in five books, entitled *Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*, which, to avoid begging the question I have to consider, has been translated, *An Exposition of Dominical Oracles*. This work is lost, all but a few extracts. One of these extracts, preserved by Eusebius, relates to a book written by Matthew, and another to a book written by Mark. The question I propose to consider is what relation (if any) the former work bears to the canonical gospel ascribed to Matthew.

The extract, which is very short, is as follows: 'Matthew wrote the Oracles (*τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο*) in the Hebrew language, and each man interpreted them as he was able.'

The extract relating to Mark is longer:—

‘and this is what the Elder said, Mark having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately, but without arrangement (οὐ μὲν τοι τάξει), as many things as he related (ἐμνημόνευσεν) either said or done by Christ.

‘For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterwards, as I said, he followed Peter, who used to make his teaching according to the occasion, and not as making a systematic disquisition (σύνταξιν) upon the Dominical oracles (or discourses, according as the reading is λογίων or λόγων), so that Mark did not act wrongly when he thus wrote some things as he related them. For of one thing he took care, not to pass by any of the things which he heard, or to falsify anything in them.’¹

These extracts were long taken (by Paley, for example²) as evidence that the canonical gospels of Matthew and Mark were known to Papias, and ascribed by him to the authors whose names they now bear. Of late years, however, another theory has been put forward: that the canonical gospels were first circulated anonymously; that Christians became curious to ascertain the names of their authors; and that these passages of Papias were laid hold of for the purpose, and the anonymous books in use in the Church identified with the books mentioned by Papias.

There is considerable reason to think that the gospels were, in fact, originally circulated anonymously.

For instance, when Clement of Alexandria wishes to describe the two gospels which in his opinion were written first, he says, not Matthew and Luke, but

¹ See Appendix i.

² *Evidences* ix. 6.

‘those which contain the genealogies,’ προγεγράφθαι τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας!—an inconvenient circumlocution, which he would scarcely have used had he not known that the manuscripts in the hands of many of his readers had no names attached by which they could be cited.³

When we look closely at the words of Eusebius, we see that he does not say that the books referred to were the canonical gospels. The one extract he says was about Matthew, doubtless meaning the apostle, and the other about Mark, who wrote the gospel, not about the gospel written by Mark. This is only material in considering how far the lost context of the passages cited may have borne out the current opinion, and we see that Eusebius does not pledge himself that it did.³

But to come to the passages themselves. The statement as to Matthew is on all sides understood to mean that he wrote, not in Hebrew properly so called, but in the language called Aramæan or Aramaic. Taking this to be so, it is utterly inapplicable to the

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* lib. vi. cap. 14.

² According to Semisch, Clement of Alexandria in his very numerous citations from the Gospels names John but three times, Matthew twice, Luke twice, and Mark once. See *The Fourth Gospel: External Evidences of Authorship*, by Ezra Abbot, p. 72.

³ In another place, *H. E.* lib. ii. cap. 15, Eusebius tells, on the authority of Clement of Alexandria, a story of Mark writing his gospel at the request of hearers of Peter; which reads very like a version of the account contained in the foregoing extract, referred to the canonical gospel of Mark, and amplified; and then says that Papias corroborates Clement. This, however, by no means deprives of its significance the fact that when Eusebius was actually quoting Papias, and may therefore be supposed to have had his book before him, he refrained from saying explicitly that the extract related to the gospel. In another place, *H. E.* lib. iii. cap. 24, Eusebius says that Matthew wrote his gospel in his native tongue. But he might have got this from Irenæus. See *H. E.* lib. v. cap. 8.

canonical gospel. For the passage implies that the interpretation of the book was a task of which everybody was in some measure capable, but only with difficulty. Now the word *ἡρμήνευσε* (=interpreted) may be taken to mean either 'explained' or 'translated.' If the former, there is nothing about the gospel of Matthew which could make it difficult to be understood by a contemporary who understood the language in which it was written. If the latter, the statement is equally unintelligible. Aramaic was not a learned language. The Christians of Palestine, whose mother-tongue it was, understood it perfectly. The Greek Christians did not understand it at all. Where then is the meaning of saying that everyone interpreted it as he was able?

When we come to the passage referring to Mark, we see a book described of a character altogether different from the canonical gospel: 'Things said and done by Christ without arrangement'—such a book as a man might have written who had listened to teaching, not in itself containing a consecutive narrative.

In order, however, to ascertain exactly the meaning of Papias, it is necessary to ascertain the sense in which he used the word *λόγια*, or oracles. Now the subject of his work being 'An Exposition of Dominical *λόγια*, or oracles,' the obvious motive he would have in making the remarks cited by Eusebius would be to collect what other writers had done with regard to the same topic. It is, therefore, probable that the word *λόγια* is used in the same sense throughout the citations. It, therefore, becomes material to determine whether it was cited twice or thrice, for in the latter case we have three equations, so to say, for

determining its meaning, and in the former only two. In order to do this it will be necessary to consider whether *λογίων* or *λόγων* is the preferable reading in the passage relating to Mark; and finally, as the intendment of the word *λόγιον* varied from time to time, it is necessary to determine as accurately as may be the date of Papias. I will consider these questions in the opposite order to that in which I have stated them, that is to say: first, the date at which Papias wrote; secondly, the question concerning the text; thirdly, the meaning of the word *λόγιον*.

CHAPTER II

THE DATE OF PAPIAS

THE first question to consider then with regard to these extracts from Papias is at what time they were written. The commonly received account, based on the Paschal Chronicle, is that Papias suffered death by martyrdom in the year 164 A.D.; in which case it would be improbable that he could have written a book of the sort attributed to him before the third decade of the second century. But I think Dr. Lightfoot, the late Bishop of Durham,¹ has proved, from remarkable coincidences of language, that this story of the martyrdom of Papias arose from the writer of the Chronicle applying to him a statement made by Eusebius as to one Papyrus; and we may therefore disregard it, and pass on to the other evidence as to the date of Papias.

The direct evidence upon the subject is contained in the following notices in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius:—

Book III. cap. 34.

'In the third year of the reign of the above-mentioned emperor (that is, Trajan) Clement, Bishop of Rome, departed this life. . . .'

¹ *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 147; originally published in the *Contemporary Review*.

Cap. 35.

'But Symeon also having ended his days in the way I have declared, a Jew of the name of Justus received in his stead the throne of the bishopric at Jerusalem. . . .'

Cap. 36.

'About their time Polycarp, a pupil of the Apostles, was eminent in Asia, having had put into his hands the bishopric of the Church at Smyrna, from those who were eye-witnesses and assistants of the Lord. About whose time Papias was becoming known, being himself Bishop of the see of Hierapolis.' (Καθ' ὃν ἐγνωρίζετο Παπίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεραπόλει παροικίας καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος.)

The next date given by Eusebius, that of the accession of Primus, Bishop of Alexandria, is the twelfth year of Trajan. This is at the very beginning of Book IV. of the Ecclesiastical History, and immediately follows the notice of the writings of Papias which concludes Book III.

Eusebius, therefore, says that Papias was not merely Bishop of Hierapolis, but getting into note about the year A.D. 101, or a few years after. The inference would be that the only work by which he was known was written before that date.

In coming to this conclusion I have not thought it necessary to enter into an investigation of the date of the martyrdom of Symeon. It is a question too obscure to throw light on anything else. A Syriac Chronicle, perhaps on the authority of this very passage, places it A.D. 104, and M. Waddington has assigned the date when Herodes Atticus, by whose order it is alleged to have taken place, was Consular Legate of Palestine to the years A.D. 105–107, his

reason for this being that these are the only years about that time when he has not evidence that other persons held that office.¹ When one couples the difficulty of assigning a date to Herodes Atticus with the statement that Symeon was a hundred and twenty years old at the time he was martyred, one is apt to suspect that the whole story is a fable. However this may be, no inference can be drawn from it that will seriously affect the above conclusion as to the date of Papias.

Irenaeus describes Papias as the hearer of John, meaning the apostle, the companion of Polycarp, and a man of primitive times, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ. Now I think Eusebius is successful in showing that Irenaeus is wrong in describing Papias as a hearer of the apostle John; still the fact that he describes him in the way above stated is not without weight in determining his date. It is language a man would not use of his own contemporary, even of a man who had flourished in his youth. We may therefore safely, on the testimony of Irenaeus, put the period of living memory, or sixty years at the least, between the time at which Irenaeus was writing and the date of the work of Papias he had in view. This would make the latest date to which the work of Papias could be assigned about A.D. 130; but of course the testimony of Irenaeus would favour a much earlier date.

Eusebius also speaks of ecclesiastical writers generally having been induced by the antiquity of Papius to adopt his opinions concerning the millennium. This would seem to show that he had evidence before him, by reason of the notices contained in different writers,

¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. ii. part 2, sect. i. pp. 445, 450.

by which to fix the date of Papias, and that these notices favoured an early date. Such a writer, for instance, as Melito, who wrote about A.D. 150, would scarcely be induced by the antiquity of a writer who wrote only five-and-twenty years earlier to adopt his views.¹

We will now turn to consider what internal evidence the extracts afford as to the date at which they were written; for which purpose I must cite another extract from Papias, preserved by Eusebius, with his comments on it:—

‘But I will not hesitate to arrange in order for you, with the interpretations, whatever things at any time I well learned from the elders and well remembered, having thoroughly established the truth concerning them. For I did not, as most men, take pleasure in those who say most, but in those who teach what is true, nor in those who relate the commandments of another man (τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολάς), but in those who relate the commandments given by the Lord to the faith and coming from the truth itself. But if anywhere anyone came who had been a follower of the elders, I used to enquire after the words of the elders. What Andrew or what Peter said? (εἶπεν), or what Philip? or what Thomas or James? or what John or Matthew? or any other of the disciples of the Lord? and the things which Aristion and John the Elder (ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης), the disciples of the Lord, say (λέγουσιν). For I did not apprehend that things out of books profited me so much as what was said by the living and abiding voice.’

¹ This must be taken as an illustration merely, as I am not aware that there is direct evidence that Melito held millenarian views. Though as he wrote a treatise on the Revelation of John (Eusebius, *H. E.* lib. iv. cap. 26) and Eusebius does not say anything to the contrary, it is probable that Melito ought to be included in the general statement of Eusebius above noticed.

On this extract Eusebius makes the following comment:—

‘Where also it is worthy to be noticed that he twice mentions the name of John, and the man of that name first mentioned he associates with Peter, James, and Matthew, and the rest of the Apostles, clearly meaning the Evangelist; but the other John he puts in a separate clause, and classes with others outside the number of the Apostles, placing Aristion before him. And he clearly names him “the Elder.” So that through these things also is shown to be true the account of those who have said that there were two in Asia who bore the same name, and that there were two sepulchres at Ephesus, and that each is still to this day called John’s.’

It has been argued that the interpretation put by Eusebius upon the words of Papias is not correct: that Papias wanted to distinguish between disciples as to whom he could get secondhand information and disciples from whom he could get direct information; and that he names John twice because he could get in his case information of both sorts, and that he applies the title Elder to him in the second place to distinguish him from Aristion, in the sense of apostle, which it is contended that he has previously applied in that sense to Andrew, Peter, &c.

On this last assumption, which is necessary for this interpretation, I think it fails. *Πρεσβύτερος*, or Elder, may be used in two senses: one its ordinary sense, as implying age; the other its technical sense, as the name of an office in the Church. In the latter sense I do not think it is ever applied specially to the Apostles. In the passage under consideration, Papias begins by using the word as importing age, that is, not men advanced in years, but men of the former

generation. This is what he means when he speaks of the things he learned from the elders. He uses the word in the same sense when he speaks of questioning those who had been followers of the elders. He then as elders instances a number of apostles and other disciples of the Lord, and then he goes on to instance Aristion and John the Elder. I can see no meaning to put upon this last phrase except that put upon it by Eusebius, that he now uses the word in a special sense, as a designation of a particular man, who for some reason or other, probably by reason of his office, had come to be known as the Elder (e.g., Cato the censor). Why else among a number of men, all named as instances of ‘elders’ from whom he had collected traditions, should he single out one to call him the Elder? This I think would be the proper interpretation of the language, even if no other John had been mentioned; but a person of the name John having been previously mentioned, there can be no doubt that the designation is added for the purpose of distinguishing two men, and that the first named is the apostle. John the Elder, therefore, is a different man from John the Apostle. Eusebius continues:—

‘To which things it is necessary to pay attention. For it is likely that the second, if one would not admit the first, beheld the revelation which is in circulation under the name of John. Papias, also, of whom we are now speaking, acknowledged that he took the words of the Apostles from those who had followed them, but says that he was himself a hearer of Aristion and John the Elder. At least he frequently mentions them by name, and places their traditions in his writings.’

A little further on, Eusebius mentions a story

which was told Papias by the daughters of Philip. From this we gather that while Papias was able to relate traditions which he had received personally from Aristion and John the Elder, who had been disciples of Jesus,¹ and also from the daughters of Philip, he was not able to report any traditions which he had gathered from any of the apostles personally. There can be no doubt on the latter point. Had Papias, who set so great store upon oral tradition, ever heard any of the apostles speak, he would certainly have mentioned it in such a way as to leave no room for doubt.

There is a more precise indication of time in that in speaking of the traditions gathered from the Apostles, Papias speaks in the past what Andrew, Peter, &c., said (εἶπεν); but in speaking of Aristion and John the Elder he uses the present, the things which Aristion and John the Elder say (λέγουσιν). The obvious inference from this change of tense is that John the Elder and Aristion were alive at the time, while the apostles he mentions were all dead. This is the opinion of Dr. Westcott, the present Bishop of Durham.² Dr. Lightfoot, indeed, suggested that λέγουσιν should be taken as the historic present used for the purpose of variety, but it is difficult to suppose that this can be the case with a present pointedly opposed to an aorist, as in this case.

I shall therefore assume that Papias wrote after

¹ As Papias in two consecutive clauses of the same sentence applies the word μαθητής to Andrew, Peter, &c., who had been disciples of Jesus in the proper sense of the word, and to Aristion and John the Elder, I think the proper inference is that it is applied to the latter also in the proper sense of the word, and that they had been actual hearers of Jesus. This is further borne out by his object, to get evidence of what Jesus had said.

² *Canon of the New Testament*, 5th edit. p. 70, note 1.

the deaths of the apostles he mentions, and during the lives of Aristion and John the Elder. The next matter to determine will be when the deaths of the two latter took place.

As regards Aristion, we are without means of information, except what may be inferred from the statement of Papias that he was a disciple of the Lord, which will place his death at some period within the duration of human life after the death of Jesus, and from the fact that it is stated in the Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 46) that one Ariston, probably the same man, was a Bishop of Smyrna before Polycarp, from which we might probably infer that he was dead before Polycarp became Bishop of Smyrna—that is, before A.D. 101.

As regards John the Elder, we have, I think, means of more exact determination. It will be noticed that Irenaeus tells us that Papias was a hearer of the apostle John. This, Eusebius points out, is a mistake; he was a hearer merely of John the Elder, and not of the apostle. From this mistake of Irenaeus, we may assume that he confounded John the Elder with John the Apostle, and generally applied to the latter traditions which reached him about the former. Now Irenaeus tells us, apparently on the authority of certain elders of Asia, that John the disciple of the Lord lived to the time of Trajan.¹ The context, coupled with his failing to make mention of John the Elder as a distinct man from John the Apostle, shows that he means John the Apostle. So interpreted, John the Apostle must have lived to the age of ninety, or, more probably, ninety-five years. For Trajan began

¹ *Adv. Haer.* lib. ii. cap. 22, sect. 5.

his reign A.D. 98, or sixty-five years after the received date of the death of Jesus. Now John the Apostle can scarcely have been less than twenty-five years old at the time of his Master's death—that is to say, we can hardly suppose a younger man chosen to be an apostle. This would give him a minimum age of ninety at the accession of Trajan.¹ But it is evidently rather straining the point to suppose John so young as twenty-five at the former epoch. He would be therefore rather over than under ninety at the latter.

We must here note that Irenaeus, in the same passage in which he states that John lived to the time of Trajan, states, on the authority of all the elders of Asia, whom he describes as professing to speak on the direct testimony of John and other apostles, that Jesus lived to beyond the age of forty or fifty. If this were so, it would increase the probability that the Apostles were men of mature age.

As I have said, Irenaeus appears to have meant his statement to apply to John the Apostle, but he says John the disciple of the Lord, probably using the words of the elders on whose authority he made the statement; and when we bear in mind the fact, which is proved, that he confounded the two Johns, there can be little doubt that the statement ought to be applied to John the Elder. Such an application will render it much more probable, for though John the Elder was a disciple of Jesus, there is no reason from that to suppose he was a grown man at the time of his Master's death: he might, for instance, have been but a boy of fifteen; in that case he would be eighty at the time of the accession of Trajan, and

¹ See Appendix vi.

his surviving to that time would involve no improbability.¹ If, however, we suppose that the statement of Irenaeus is properly referred to John the Apostle, we are involved in this further difficulty. It is a necessary inference from the statement of Papias that John the Elder and Aristion must have survived John the Apostle by all the time which must have elapsed while Papias was collecting his traditions and writing his book; else, as both Johns lived at Ephesus, he would have got traditions direct from the apostle. Now this must have been some years—say, ten years or thereabouts. If, therefore, John the Elder and Aristion must have been eighty or thereabouts at the accession of Trajan, and survived John the Apostle by a time sufficient for this purpose, we should arrive at the conclusion that they, too, lived to an age approaching ninety. Now it would be not a little remarkable that there should be three disciples of Jesus in the same neighbourhood, two bearing the same name and living in the same city, who attained this great age. I think, therefore, that it may be safely concluded that John the disciple of the Lord who lived to the time of Trajan was John the Elder. This, I rather gather, is the opinion of Dr. Abbott, expressed in his article on the gospels in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.'

I ought here to notice an authority bearing upon the age of Papias, cited both by Dr. Lightfoot and

¹ Dr. Salmon remarks that, on the assumption that John the Elder was distinct from the apostle, 'we can hardly help identifying him with the John who is said to have lived to the reign of Trajan, and to have been the teacher of Polycarp and the early Asiatic bishops.' *Introduction to the New Testament*, 6th edit. p. 290. Dr. Salmon, however, doubts the distinction between John the Elder and John the Apostle.

by Dr. Westcott. It is an introduction prefixed to a Latin MS. of the fourth gospel found in the Vatican library, and assigned by Tischendorf to the ninth century. It is as follows:—

‘Evangelium Johannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab Johanne adhuc in corpore constituto; sicut Papias nomine Hierapolitanus, discipulus Johannis carus, in exotericis, id est in extremis (externis) quinque libris retulit. Descripsit vero evangelium dictante Johanne recte. Verum Martion haereticus, cum ab eo fuisset improbatus, abjectus est ab Johanne. Is vero scripta vel epistolas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt.’¹

This passage is thus rendered by Dr. Lightfoot:—

‘The Gospel of John was made known and given to the churches by John, while he yet remained in the body, as (one) Papias by name, of Hierapolis, a beloved disciple of John, has related in his exoteric, that is, in his last five books; but he wrote down the Gospel at the dictation of John correctly.

‘But Marcion, the heretic, when he had been censured by him because he held heretical opinions, was cast off by John. Now he had brought writings or letters to him from the brethren that were in Pontus.’²

From the passage interpreted in this way it has been supposed that there were five spurious books annexed to the genuine books of Papias, which were known as the exoteric books to which reference has been made. This theory was originated by Overbeck, and has since been adopted by Hilgenfeld. If it be accepted, of course the passage is of no account. The theory adopted by Dr. Lightfoot is an earlier theory of Hilgenfeld—that *exotericis* is a mistake for

¹ Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*, 5th edit. p. 77.

² *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 210.

exegeticis, which would make the passage run ‘as Papias . . . has related in his expositions in five books,’ for of course the words *id est in extremis* are merely a gloss of some editor or transcriber to explain the word *exotericis*, which he did not understand.

This passage is quoted both by Dr. Westcott and Dr. Lightfoot to show that Papias was acquainted with the gospel of St. John; but if it proves anything, it proves that Papias actually wrote that gospel at the dictation of John, and stated this in his five books. Papias therefore must have been, if the passage can be relied on, a contemporary of John who wrote the gospel, and this is why I mention the passage here. Now these statements are directly contradicted by Eusebius when he says, having special reference to John, that Papias by no means asserts that he was a hearer or eye-witness of the holy apostles. It is difficult to reject this statement of Eusebius in favour of that of an anonymous Latin writer of the ninth century who had probably never seen the writings of Papias, and could probably not read a word of them, and who shows his ignorance of ecclesiastical history by relating a story which implies that Marcion had published his heresy in the time of the apostle John. But I venture to doubt whether either the German or English critics I have mentioned have found out the true meaning of the passage. The words *id est in extremis* may be rejected as a mere gloss, but these words show that the word *exotericis* puzzled one of the later editors. This word was therefore not introduced at the last stage, and may more probably have come down from the

earliest form of the statement. Now the word *exotericus* has a recognised meaning which appears very apt for the interpretation of this passage. It means that which is contained in writing as opposed to mere oral instruction. The backbone of the assertion, then, will appear to be this: that what Papias received orally from John he reduced to writing in five books. Understanding by John, John the Elder, this statement is accurate, agreeing exactly with Eusebius. The blunder which has been made is in assuming that the traditions which were thus reduced to writing by Papias constituted the fourth gospel. There can be little doubt that the passage in question is a mere amplification and embellishment of some such statement about the traditions received orally from John, and reduced to writing by Papias in five books, misapplied to the fourth gospel. The passage therefore has no value whatever.

In connection with this passage from the Vatican MS. should be considered the Greek passage contained in the 'Catena' published by B. Corder, which I will quote from the translation of Dr. Lightfoot or Mr. Harmer, whichever it is:—

'For last of these, John, surnamed the Son of Thunder, when he was now a very old man, as Irenaeus and Eusebius and a succession of trustworthy historians have handed down to us, about the time when terrible heresies had cropped up, dictated the Gospel to his own disciple, the virtuous Papias, of Hierapolis, to fill up what was lacking in those who before him had proclaimed the word to the nations throughout all the earth.'

We have here the same story that the fourth gospel was written by Papias at the dictation of the

apostle John, but the writer, instead of citing as his authority the lost books of Papias, cites the extant works of Irenaeus and Eusebius. What could be learnt from those works is, that Papias committed to writing traditions he had received from a disciple of the Lord called John, whom the former writer supposed to be the apostle of the same name and the later writer did not. Some statement of this fact, made by some one of the trustworthy historians mentioned in the extract and distorted by some other of them, must be the basis of the fable contained in the extract; it is therefore of no value at all.

In considering whether the statements of Irenaeus as to John the disciple of the Lord ought to be applied to John the Apostle, we ought not to pass over the statement of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, that John the Apostle was a martyr, a fact unknown to Irenaeus, or at all events not mentioned by him, and which therefore, if accepted, must raise considerable doubt as to the accuracy of the information furnished by Irenaeus with regard to the apostle.

There can be no doubt that the expression of Polycrates, 'John who lay upon the bosom of the Lord . . . both martyr and teacher' (*καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος*),¹ amounts to a statement that the apostle John suffered death by martyrdom. In the next sentence the same word is applied by Polycrates in exactly the same way to Polycarp, and in the succeeding sentences to Thraseas and Sagaris, in whose cases there can be no doubt of the meaning. Moreover, in the time of Polycrates the word appears to have been already restricted to those who suffered death for their faith,

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 24.

as we learn from the letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienna. When their fellow-Christians applied the name 'martyrs' to the prisoners who had suffered repeated tortures, but were still alive, the sufferers refused the title, saying, 'They are already martyrs whom Christ has thought worthy to be taken up in their confession, and has sealed their martyrdom by the issue, but we are mean and poor confessors.'¹ *Ἐκεῖνοι ἤδη μάρτυρες, οὓς ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ Χριστὸς ἡξίωσεν ἀναληφθῆναι, ἐπισφραγισάμενος αὐτῶν διὰ τῆς ἐξόδου τὴν μαρτυρίαν· ἡμεῖς δὲ ὁμολογοὶ μέτριοι καὶ ταπεινοί.*

The next question then to consider is the weight to be attached to the statement of Polycrates. It is contained in a letter addressed to Victor, Bishop of Rome, upon the Paschal controversy. Victor became Bishop of Rome, as we learn from Eusebius, in the tenth year of Commodus, that is, A.D. 189, and continued until about the ninth year of Severus, that is, A.D. 201. If, therefore, we take A.D. 195 as the date of the letter, we shall not be far wrong. In it Polycrates says that he was then sixty-five years in the Lord (*ἑξήκοντα πέντε ἔτη ἔχων ἐν Κυρίῳ*), which I suppose means that he was sixty-five years old. He was therefore born about A.D. 130. He professes to speak concerning the Paschal controversy according to the tradition of his family, seven of whom were bishops. He writes as having that acquaintance with the sentiments of the people of Ephesus and that part of Asia that would be possessed by a man who had spent his life there. Now the question is, What is the value of his statements concerning the apostle John? Suppos-

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 2.

ing Polycrates could understand and remember historical statements made to him when he was ten years old, and taking the duration of living memory to be sixty years, he might have heard the testimony of eye-witnesses to events as early as the year A.D. 80 about, but not earlier. Now, on the supposition that the statements of Irenaeus as to John the disciple of the Lord ought not to be applied to the apostle, we have no information as to when the apostle died beyond that he was alive in the year 68, the date of the Book of Revelation, at which time he would be sixty years of age or upwards. If he lived to the year A.D. 80, he would be seventy-two years old or upwards. It would be rather more probable that he would die, in the ordinary course of nature, before that date than after it; and if his life were cut short by martyrdom, it would therefore be more likely to be before that date than after it.

We have therefore no reason to think that Polycrates could speak from the testimony of eye-witnesses as to the martyrdom of the apostle John. The event, however, is one of a class likely, so far as the main fact was concerned, to be accurately transmitted by the tradition of two generations. The statement of Polycrates is therefore one which it would appear we ought to accept, and its acceptance discredits the testimony of Irenaeus.

In considering the weight to be attached to the two men, it must be remembered that, though about the same age and born in the same locality, Irenaeus left Asia when a boy (*παῖς*), while Polycrates resided there all his life. Now children, though they remember clearly things they witnessed themselves, do not usually

pick up clear or accurate accounts of historical facts from the statements of others.

I will now consider two passages which support very strongly one of the conclusions for which I have contended—viz., that the apostle John suffered martyrdom—but one of which offers an argument in favour of a later date for Papias than I have assigned him. The first passage is found in the 'Chronicon' of George called Hamartolus, or the Sinner, a monk of the ninth century. This writer, after remarking that John survived the rest of the twelve, and then suffered as a martyr (*μαρτυρίου κατηξίωται*), continues as follows:—

'For Papias, the Bishop of Hierapolis, who was an eye-witness of him, says in the second book (*λόγῳ*) of the "Dominical Oracles" (*τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων*) that he was killed by the Jews.'¹

The other is from an anonymous note lately found by De Boor in the Codex Baroccianus and conjectured to have been extracted from the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Philip of Side, which was published about A.D. 427. It is as follows:—

'Papias in his second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were killed by the Jews. The aforesaid Papias has narrated as having received it from the daughters of Philip that Barsabas, who is also called Justus, being tested by the unbelievers, drinking the poison of a viper in the name of the Christ, was preserved harmless. And he narrates also other wonders, and especially that concerning the mother of (Manaimus?), who was raised from the dead, about those raised from the dead by the Christ, that they lived until Hadrian (*ἰσραεὶ δὲ καὶ*

¹ For the context of this passage see Appendix vii.

ἄλλα θαύματα καὶ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὴν μητέρα Μαναΐμου τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστᾶσαν· περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων ὅτι ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ ἔζων).'

It appears, therefore, from these two authorities, that the works of Papias contained a direct statement that John the Apostle was killed by the Jews. That is a very strong confirmation of the conclusion I have drawn from other sources, that the apostle John suffered death by martyrdom, and was a different person from John the disciple of the Lord, who continued to the time of Trajan. Some writers have argued from these passages that the apostle John was put to death in Palestine, and, therefore, was never in Asia at all. It does not at all follow, because John was killed by the Jews, that he was killed in Palestine.

He might have been killed in a riot, or have died from the effects of corporal punishment inflicted upon him by his countrymen as one of their own community; or even, if put to death by the Roman authorities at the instigation of the Jews, he might, without any very great inaccuracy, be said to have been killed by the Jews. Dr. Lightfoot refused to believe on the authority of the passage in George Hamartolus,¹ and Dr. Salmon² has refused to believe on the authority of both passages, that Papias made any such statement; but there is no reason to be adduced to the contrary, except the silence of Eusebius as to Papias having made any such statement. Now had Eusebius desired to prove that the apostle John suffered martyrdom, this argument would have great weight, but it is very doubtful whether Eusebius would desire to bring this

¹ *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 211 *et seq.*

² *Introduction to the New Testament*, 4th edit. p. 319.

fact into prominence. The stand he takes is this. In Book III. chapter xxiii. of his 'Ecclesiastical History' he cites from Irenaeus the statement that John remained until the time of Trajan, and in chapter xxxi. of the same book he cites from Polycrates the statement that John, who was both a martyr and a teacher, rested at Ephesus. Eusebius does not put together these testimonies in his own words, but the natural inference is that he accepted both statements, and believed that John survived to the time of Trajan, and afterwards suffered death by martyrdom. That Eusebius did not want to give prominence to the fact of the martyrdom of John is shown by his leaving the statement of Polycrates to speak for itself. It is therefore not surprising that he did not quote another testimony to the same effect from Papias.

I will now pass on to the bearing of the latter quotation upon the date of Papias. It appears to state that Papias made a statement about those who were raised from the dead by Christ, that they lived till Hadrian. If Papias made such a statement, he must, of course, have written after the accession of Hadrian, and after the death of John the Elder and Aristion.

But in this aspect the passage is open to the following observations: (1) The passage appears to be very awkwardly constructed. The sentence would come to a natural stop after the word *ἀναστᾶσαν*, making it read: 'And he narrated also other wonders, and especially that concerning the mother of Manaimus, who was raised from the dead.' If the sentence is supposed to run on further, it must be construed thus: 'And he narrated also other wonders concerning those raised from the dead by the Christ, that they

lived till Hadrian, and especially concerning the mother of Manaimus, who was raised from the dead,' the latter clause being in the original an awkward parenthesis. (2) The statement about those raised from the dead by Christ living till Hadrian excites great suspicion that it is derived from a passage in an apology addressed to Hadrian by Quadratus, in which, speaking of the long lives of those healed or raised from the dead by Christ, he says, 'So that some of them reached even to our times.' It will be noticed that the statement of Quadratus (*ὥστε καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους χρόνους τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀφίκοντο*),¹ except so far as it affirms that Christ healed persons and raised them from the dead, has nothing miraculous or even improbable about it. He does not state that any such persons were alive at the time he was writing, probably soon after the accession of Hadrian. Using the aorist (*ἀφίκοντο*) he implies the contrary, and by the phrase 'to our times' he implies that such persons survived to some period within the lifetime of himself as well as Hadrian, but not that they survived until the accession of Hadrian to the Empire. Hadrian was born A.D. 71, and Quadratus probably about the same time, that is, thirty-eight years after the death of Jesus. There is no improbability in some persons who were brought to Jesus when young living beyond this period. In the quotation the statement is made somewhat remarkable, though not at all miraculous, by making these persons survive until the accession of Hadrian, for that is what it must be taken to mean. The accession of Hadrian was eighty-three years after the death of Jesus, and therefore it is just within the

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* lib. iv. c. 3.

bounds of ordinary possibilities that some person who was brought to Jesus in infancy might survive till that period. This difference does not make it the less likely that the statement is taken from Quadratus. Stories have always a tendency to assume a more marvellous tone on being repeated, but the marvel is not sufficient for it to be classed as such along with the raising of persons from the dead. (3) There is again the consideration that Eusebius does not notice any such statement on the part of Papias. Now in this case the silence of Eusebius is of weight, for he desired to depreciate Papias, and it would have tended to do so as a retailer of traditions, could he have shown that he did not write until after the accession of Hadrian.

Putting all these things together, I think the proper conclusion is that the extract has broken off in the middle of a sentence; that the statement as to what was said by Papias ends with the word *ἀναστᾶσαν*, which ought to be followed by a full stop, and the following words are the commencement of another sentence, which, when complete, was a statement about what was said by Quadratus. Such an error is not at all improbable in a marginal note.

We may, therefore, disregard this passage as having any bearing upon the date of Papias.

Before dismissing the subject of the end of the apostle John, we ought to consider the curious remark made by Tertullian, who apostrophises the church of Rome in these words:—

‘Happy Church, for which Apostles poured forth the whole doctrine with their blood, where Peter equals the passion of the Lord, where Paul is crowned with the death of John (i.e. the Baptist), where the Apostle John, after

that having been plunged into boiling oil he suffered nothing, is banished unto an island.’¹

This story of the miraculous deliverance of the apostle John must have been current at Rome at the end of the second century. The most probable explanation of it is, that there were current different traditions about two different men of the name of John: of John the Apostle, that he suffered martyrdom, and of John the Elder, that he died a natural death at extreme old age in the reign of Trajan. These two men being confounded, the accounts were reconciled, as nearly as might be, by the story preserved by Tertullian.

Little reliance can be placed upon the scene of the martyrdom being at Rome; the passage in Tertullian sufficiently explains the origin of this part of the story. It was for the aggrandisement of the Roman Church to be the place of martyrdom of as many apostles as possible.

We thus get to the commencement of the reign of Trajan, or—as in the absence of evidence it would be rash to assume that Aristion lived to eighty as well as John the Elder—some years earlier, as the latest date to which the work of Papias can be assigned.

The next question is, what evidence there is for determining an anterior limit to the date of its composition.

There are three considerations which may assist us in this: First, the impression of lapse of time during which Papias was collecting his traditions, which could not begin to run till after the death of the last of the apostles he named, or, at all events, of John. As regards the apostles named by Papias, we have no

¹ *De Præscript. Hæret.* 36.

evidence when or where they died, with the exception of Peter, James, and John. James, supposing the Lord's brother to be meant, was put to death A.D. 63, and Peter is commonly supposed to have perished in the Neronian persecution, A.D. 64. As regards John we have, as I have shown, considerable reason to suppose that he was alive in the latter part of the year A.D. 68, the date of the composition of the Book of Revelation. At that time he would be sixty years of age or upwards. Assuming the inference that the John the disciple of the Lord who lived to the age of Trajan was not John the Apostle, but John the Elder, is correct, we have no further information about him except the statements already noticed, that he was a martyr and was killed by the Jews, and that he died at Ephesus.

We should get the earliest date for the work of Papias by supposing John the Apostle to have died soon after A.D. 68, which, supposing him to have suffered martyrdom, would be by no means improbable, such an event being more likely to happen during the commotions preceding the establishment of the authority of Vespasian, or the excitement against the Jews occasioned by their insurrection, which must gradually have subsided after the destruction of Jerusalem, than at a later period. Moreover, it must be remembered that martyrdom was rarely attained by one who did not court it, and that the frame of mind of the writer of the Revelation was that of a man likely to court martyrdom. It is therefore not improbable that John did not very long survive the publication of his book: in fact, he writes as if he were already in the hands of the authorities.

Taking this early date for the death of John, and making some allowance for Papias to collect his traditions or write his book, we should get about A.D. 80 as the earliest date at which that book could be written.

However, without assigning an early date for the death of the apostle John, there can be no reason to suppose that he survived the year A.D. 80, which would make him attain the age of seventy-two years or upwards. If we allow fifteen years for Papias to collect his traditions, this would bring us to the year A.D. 95 as the date of the composition of his book.

Another way of fixing the date of Papias is by reference to the time at which he collected his materials.

This was after the seven named disciples of Jesus—Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, and Matthew—and the great bulk of the disciples of Jesus were dead; but at a time at which there was no difficulty in finding people who could narrate, from their own knowledge, what these seven named and other disciples of Jesus had said.

Papias, it must be noticed, does not speak as if he had, by some particular good luck, come upon some person who had been a hearer of the Apostles, but implies that he had lived at a time when hearers of the Apostles were commonly to be met with, and he had questioned them and noted what they said.

Now when any event has been known to a large number of people of different ages, it will commonly be easy to find witnesses of it for about forty years after it happened. After this period the number of witnesses will rapidly fall off, till after sixty years they will ordinarily be all gone. This follows from

the consideration that after the lapse of forty years the witnesses must have been either under twenty at the time of the event witnessed, or over sixty at the time of giving their testimony, and that young persons ordinarily do not sufficiently comprehend the import of events which do not immediately concern themselves to treasure them up in their memories, whilst the memories of old people frequently fail also, especially as to events which did not immediately concern themselves.

We ought, therefore, to place the time for Papias collecting his traditions within the period of forty years after the events—that is, after a time at which the seven disciples named, and many other disciples of Jesus, were living. One of these disciples, James, we know died A.D. 63; another, Peter, is generally supposed to have died A.D. 64. Matthew must, from the tradition in the Gospels, have been a man of middle age in the lifetime of Jesus. He would, therefore, be a man of seventy or upwards A.D. 63. There would, therefore, be no probability that he long survived that date. We do not know when Andrew, Philip, or Thomas died; it is, however, more probable than otherwise that some one of them would be dead before, say, A.D. 68. After A.D. 70 we may be certain that persons who had been disciples of Jesus would be scarce. Now for persons to have been able to narrate what they had heard from the apostles and disciples of Jesus, we must allow the witnesses to have been hearers of these apostles and disciples for some period of time. We cannot suppose that the informants of Papias simply recorded dying confessions. If, therefore, we suppose that they must

have been able to remember events as early as A.D. 60, we shall not be requiring too much. This would make the period during which Papias was collecting his traditions coincide with some part of the last forty years of the first century; but he might, so far as this branch of the argument is concerned, have written his book early in the second century—that is, supposing the date assumed for the traditions collected (A.D. 60) is sufficiently early. But it is not so. To assume it is to assume that Papias only collected traditions of the last few years of the lives of the disciples of the Lord. We ought, therefore, to put that date a little earlier, and this will bring us to the last decade of the first century as the date for the work of Papias.

The remaining considerations arise from the books we know Papias quoted. These comprise, as we are told by Eusebius, the first epistle of Peter and the first epistle of John, and, as we learn from Andrew and Arethas,¹ who were both bishops of Caesarea, the Apocalypse. The latter fact merely places the composition of Papias's work later than A.D. 68.

So little is ascertainable about the date of the first epistle of John and the first epistle of Peter, that they are more likely to be determined by, than to aid in, determining the date of Papias. We arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that the work of Papias must have been written not earlier than about A.D. 80, or later than about A.D. 98; but that about A.D. 90 would seem to be its most probable date.

This is an earlier date than that generally assigned

¹ See *post*, p. 96; also Cramer, *Catena*, p. 350 *et seq.*; Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 201.

to the book; but so far as concerns the tenor of my argument—that is, so far as bears upon the meaning of the word *λόγιον*—I do not think it would make any difference if it were put fifteen or twenty years earlier or later.

CHAPTER III

JOHN THE ELDER

As the foregoing argument turns, to some extent, on the distinction between John the Elder and John the Apostle, it may be as well, before leaving it, to collect the evidence for and against that distinction.

The evidence against that distinction is, that Irenæus does not appear to be cognisant of it—that is to say, any one ignorant of the distinction reading Irenæus would not have the distinction suggested to him, but if any one reads Irenæus with the distinction in his mind, there is much in Irenæus which leads to the inference that Irenæus was aware of the distinction, and purposely wrote in such a way as to enable him to ignore his acquaintance with it without telling any direct untruth. Thus Irenæus habitually describes John as the disciple of the Lord (*ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητὴς, μαθητὴς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν*, 'discipulus domini,' e.g. book ii. cap. 22, ss. 3, 5; book iii. cap. 1, s. 1; cap. 3, s. 4; cap. 2, s. 1; cap. 16, s. 5; book v. cap. 33, s. 3; Eusebius, 'H. E.' book v. cap. 24) never as an apostle, though he once refers to him by that name, and, of course, he includes him with others as apostles, and he does not speak of any other apostle singly as a disciple of the Lord. When Ire-

naeus has occasion to mention an apostle, he does so most frequently simply by his name, without any title, and this is the case with John as well as the others; but he occasionally applies the title apostle to other apostles singly, *e.g.* to Peter, book iii. cap. 12, s. 1, or to Paul, book iii. cap. 6, s. 5, and book iv. cap. 26, s. 4.

It is evident, as regards John, that if Irenaeus had intended to confound two men, both of whom were disciples of Jesus, and of whom only one was an apostle, he could not have adopted a terminology better fitted for the purpose. Now nothing is more probable than that Irenaeus would desire to confound the two men. He had been accustomed, all his life, to plume himself upon having been in youth a hearer of Polycarp, who in turn had been a hearer of one John, a disciple of the Lord. Irenaeus had, no doubt, grown up in the belief that this John was none other than the apostle, and had derived consideration in the Church from his reputed connection with him. It would not be until Irenaeus came to study the works of Papias and other ancient writers that he would see anything to cast a doubt on this cherished belief. When he did see anything to suggest this doubt, it is not at all surprising that he resolutely determined to cast any such doubt away from him, and to make John the disciple of the Lord, who lived to the time of Trajan, one person with the apostle.

He could do this without to the letter falsifying his authorities by applying, in all critical passages, to both men indifferently the title which they had in common, and neglecting ever to use any mark of distinction between them.

Justin spoke of John as one of the apostles ('Dial.' cap. 81).

Writers subsequent to Irenaeus often speak of the apostle John as the disciple of the Lord, perhaps following Irenaeus, but by no means habitually as he did. Thus Clement of Alexandria, in the passage preserved by Eusebius, 'H. E.' lib. iii. cap. 23, speaks of John as the apostle; so does Tertullian ('De Praeser. Haer.' cap. 36).

With the language of Irenaeus may be contrasted that made use of by the writer of the Muratorian fragment, generally thought his contemporary, who seems to imply that he considered the John who wrote the Fourth Gospel to have been a disciple of the Lord but not an apostle. He says—I quote the translation in the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library':—

'The Fourth Gospel is that of John, one of the disciples ('ex decipolis,' no doubt correctly restored 'ex discipulis'). When his fellow disciples and bishops entreated him ('cohortantibus condiscipulis et ep̄s suis') he said, Fast ye now with me for the space of three days, and let us recount to each other whatever may be revealed to each of us. On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles ('ex apostolis'), that John should relate all things in his own name,' &c.

The story told in this passage is, of course, a fable, but the contrast so pointedly drawn between John, one of the disciples, and Andrew, one of the apostles, implies the belief in a John who was a disciple, but not an apostle of sufficient note for the Fourth Gospel to be attributed to him, and supports the theory of the separate existence of the Elder. In fact, the antithesis between John the Apostle and John the Disciple which is concealed by the language of Irenaeus is here

brought out by the juxtaposition of the words. This, of course, is not necessarily the original language of the author of the fragment, it may be the language of some writer from whom he borrowed the fable.

From what Eusebius says in the twenty-fifth chapter of his seventh book, he evidently refers, when he mentions 'the account of those who have said that there were two in Asia who bore the same name, and that there were two sepulchres in Ephesus, and that each was still called John's,' to Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, who flourished in the middle of the third century, from whom he quotes the following words: 'They say there are two monuments in Ephesus and each is called John's.' Besides this, in chapter 46, of book iii. of the 'Apostolic Constitutions,' in the enumeration of bishops stated to have been ordained by apostles, is the statement: 'Of Ephesus, Timotheus, ordained by Paul, and John by me John.' What is the exact historical value of a statement contained in the last-mentioned fiction it may be hard to say; it may probably be sufficient evidence of a generally accepted tradition that there were two Johns at Ephesus in apostolic times, one the apostle and another younger man whom he ordained bishop. Moreover, the statement in the 'Apostolic Constitutions' does not appear to be derived from either Dionysius or Eusebius, neither of whom states that the second John was ever a bishop, though, according to the ancient interpretation of the term, this may be implied by the title 'Elder' (*πρεσβύτερος*) given him by Papias.

A piece of evidence as to the existence of John the Elder, as distinct from John the Apostle, the weight of which deserves to be considered, is to be found in

the two letters commonly known as the second and third epistles of John, and attributed to the apostle. When the books of the New Testament came to be collected, or, perhaps rather I should say, when these letters came to be inserted among the collected books of the New Testament, they were probably designated second and third, for convenience of reference,¹ and the first letter being attributed to the apostle, this designation produced the belief that they were all by the same author, and this no doubt was the opinion of many of the Fathers. For instance, Irenaeus (iii. 16, 8) quotes the second epistle as the work of John the disciple of the Lord, meaning no doubt the apostle. But Jerome tells us, that the opinion handed down by most writers was that the two later letters were written, not by John the Apostle, but by John the Elder.²

The earliest certain evidence we have of the existence of the second epistle is the quotation of it by Irenaeus above mentioned, and the earliest certain evidence we have of the existence of the third epistle is the mention of it by Origen, who does not appear to have thought either it or the second epistle the work of the apostle.³

We have evidence, therefore, that the second

¹ Clement of Alexandria distinguishes the first as the larger (*μελῶν*) epistle (*Strom.* ii. 38, cited Bleek's *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 226).

² *De viris illust.* cc. 9, 18, *ibid.*

³ 'He (the apostle John) has also left an epistle of very few lines. Let it be that he left also a second and a third, since not all say these to be genuine. However, both of them do not make a hundred lines' (*Καταλέλοιπε καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πάντο ὀλίγων στίχων. Ἐστὼ δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην· ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας. πλὴν οὐκ εἰσι στίχων ἑκατὸν*). Origen, cited Eusebius *H. E.* lib. vi. cap. 25.

It will be noticed that while Clement speaks of the 'larger' epistle, Origen speaks of the second and third. This points to the collection in the interval of the three letters into one volume.

epistle was in existence at the time of its quotation by Irenaeus, say A.D. 185, and that the third epistle was in existence a generation afterwards.

In addition to this, there is the evidence of the Muratorian fragment. It is difficult to estimate the effect of this evidence, as well as the weight which ought to be given to it, from the exceedingly corrupt state of the document and from its author being unknown, and from the doubt that exists as to its age. The fragment, which is mutilated at the beginning, makes mention of the third book of the Gospel according to Luke, who, it says, began to speak from the birth of John. It then apparently states that John, one of the disciples, wrote the fourth book of the Gospels and tells the fable we have noticed above, and proceeds :—

‘quid ergo mirum si Iohannes tam constanter sincula etiā in epistulis suis proferam dicens in semeipsu quae uidimus oculis nostris et auribus audiimus et manus nostrae palpauerunt haec scripsimus vobis sic etiam non solum uisurem sed auditorem sed et scriptorē omnium mirabiliū dñi per ordinem profetetur.’

This passage is thus translated in the ‘Ante-Nicene Christian Library’ :—

‘What marvel is it, then, that John brings forward these several things so constantly in his epistles, also saying in his own person : “What we have seen with our eyes and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, that have we written” ? For thus he professes himself to be not only the eye-witness, but also the hearer, and besides that the historian of all the wondrous facts concerning the Lord in their order.’

This translation depends upon a restoration of

the text, by which ‘singula’ is put for ‘sincula,’ and ‘proferat’ for ‘proferam,’ not to mention less important restorations.

It is not easy to put any meaning at all upon the text in its unrestored state, or to suggest any less extensive restoration. But it is obvious that, though epistles are mentioned in the plural, the writer is referring to the first epistle only. The fragment then goes on to mention the Acts as the work of Luke, and then the Epistles of Paul, who is said to have followed the example of his predecessor John, in only writing by name to seven churches. The fragment then mentions that there were in circulation an epistle to the Laodiceans, and another to the Alexandrians, forged in the name of Paul, addressed to the heresy of Marcion, and several others which could not be received in the Catholic Church, and proceeds as follows : ‘Epistola sane inde et superscriptio iohannis duas in catholica habentur et sapientia ab amicis salomonis in honore ipsius scripta.’ In this passage ‘Judae’ is, of course, restored for Jude, and I think all critics would read ‘duac’ for ‘duas.’ ‘Superscriptio’ may be variously restored as ‘superscripti,’ ‘superscriptae,’ or ‘superscriptione,’ of which the last appears to me the most probable. These restorations would make the passage run : ‘The epistle, indeed, of Jude, and two with John’s name superscribed, or superscribed as (the work) of John, or with the superscription of John, are held in the Catholic Church, and Wisdom written by the friends of Solomon in his honour.’ These renderings are all equivalent. Critics who adopt the restoration ‘superscripti’ have rendered the passage, though not, as I think, accurately : ‘The epistle, indeed, of

Jude, and two of the above-named John, are held in the Catholic Church,' but this is improbable. The phrase 'above-named' is not used anywhere else in the fragment, though there is occasion for it, if the writer affected the sort of precision of language which it implies, Luke as well as John being mentioned more than once in the fragment, and as regards John it is useless, as two persons at least of that name have been previously mentioned.

The fragment continues: 'We receive the Apocalypses of John and Peter only which' (in the singular) 'some of us are unwilling to read in the church.' The fragment then comments on the degree of respect to be paid to the 'Pastor of Hermas,' and after some corrupt lines, in which the only thing intelligible is the non-reception of some works of Valentinus and Marcion, breaks off abruptly.

It is obvious that the writer is commenting on a New Testament part of which, at all events, had got a definite order, and that he mentions epistles of John twice. The first notice, which occurs between the notice of the Fourth Gospel and the Acts, is only applicable to the first epistle, and probably was in the original form of the document explicitly confined to it. The second notice, which follows the epistles of Paul, and is only introduced after the writer has begun to comment on doubtful books, speaks only of two epistles, and is probably intended to refer to the second and third. If this is so, we arrive at the conclusion, from the study of the fragment, that at the time it was written the first epistle was placed next after the Gospel and treated as undoubtedly genuine; but the second and third, though generally read in

the churches, were considered of uncertain authorship, and placed among doubtful books at the end of the New Testament. The mention made of the Wisdom of Solomon shows that it was consistent with the views of the writer to reckon in the Canon a book which he thought undoubtedly spurious.

The date of the Muratorian fragment is generally given as a little after 170 A.D. Dr. Salmon places it not earlier than the beginning of the third century; I am inclined to be of that opinion, for the following reason. The language of the fragment appears to show that the books of the New Testament, or at all events the Gospels, had been collected in a volume, so that the third and fourth books can be spoken of. I am not aware of any writings so early as the second century which would suggest this inference. The language of Clement of Alexandria at the end of it, describing the Gospels of Matthew and Luke as those which contain the genealogies, and the first epistle of John as the 'larger,' is in strong contrast.

The inference to draw from the fragment is that the second and third epistles, as late as the beginning of the third century, were placed in a different category from the first, and this is very unfavourable to their being by the same author as the first.

As against the two epistles being by the author of the first, another weighty fact is their non-inclusion in the Peshito-Syriac version, which contains the first epistle. This is not explicable like their non-quotation by writers like Papias and Justin, who quote the first epistle, on the ground that no need arose for it. The object of the framers of the version would be to include all books of similar authority. We may,

therefore, conclude that at the time of the making of the Peshito version, or rather of the old Syriac on which it was founded, there was a well-marked difference between the authority accorded to the first epistle and the two others, if, indeed, they were then in existence, and this, I think, is conclusive that they ought not to be attributed to the author of the first epistle. If they had been his workmanship, all three letters would have been collected long before the making of that version, would have circulated together, and would have appeared equally authentic. The framers of the version inserting one would, as of course, have inserted the others also. But the resemblance in style between the second and third epistles on the one hand, and the first on the other, is so great, that if they are not by the same author, it must be the result of intentional imitation, which would be strong evidence of forgery.

Assuming, however, the letters to be a forgery, it may nevertheless be urged that they show a general belief, at the time they were written, in a John who was supposed to be understood by the title 'The Elder,' of sufficient repute to have letters forged in his name, and as this cannot well be later than A.D. 185 and may be much earlier, it affords a powerful confirmation of the interpretation placed by Eusebius on the passage in Papias showing the existence of the same person.

As against this, it may be remarked that one of the peculiarities of the style of the first epistle is the application of the phrase 'Little children' to the persons addressed, and the effect of this is imitated

not the less effectively because indirectly by the application of the correlative term 'The Elder' to the supposed author, in the second and third epistles. The use of this term would therefore be explicable by reason of the intention of the author to imitate the first epistle, and any inference that might be drawn from it as to the belief in any John known as the Elder would fall to the ground.

It would appear, therefore, probable that the second and third epistles of John were intended to be attributed to the writer of the first epistle, assumed to be John the Apostle, as the second epistle, at all events, was in fact attributed by Irenaeus. No inference can, therefore, be drawn from the writing of these epistles to the existence of John the Elder. From the fact, however, narrated by Jerome, that the epistles had been very generally attributed to John the Elder, such an inference may be drawn, and the exclusion of the letters from the Peshito version is not at all inconsistent with the prevalence of such a belief as to their authorship. On the contrary, the existence of such a theory would be of itself a reason for not attributing them to the apostle, and therefore excluding them from the canon.

On the whole, though the evidence, apart from the extracts of Papias, might not of itself be sufficient to establish the separate existence of John the Elder, it is sufficient to confirm to a considerable degree the interpretation placed by Eusebius upon these extracts and altogether to rebut any positive objection that might be raised to that interpretation—that such a person had not otherwise been heard of, but was a

subtlety evolved from the brain of Dionysius for the purpose of discrediting the Apocalypse, though that, but for this purpose, we should have heard nothing about such a person from Eusebius at all events, there may be no manner of doubt.

CHAPTER IV

THE VARIOUS READINGS *λόγων* AND *λογίων*

I WILL now pass on to consider the question with regard to the text of Eusebius, or rather of Papias. In the extract relating to Mark, it is said that Peter did not speak as if he were making a syntax—whatever that may mean—of the Dominical oracles. The word translated oracles is *λογίων*. Instead of *λογίων* some manuscripts read *λόγων*, which would make the passage run that Peter did not speak as if he were making a syntax of the Dominical discourses, which there could be no doubt, I think, would mean the Lord's discourses.

The reading *λόγων* is adopted by Burton and Valesius, but Stephens, Stroth, Zimmermann, Routh, and more recently Laemmer, have adopted the reading *λογίων*.

To turn from the names of the editors to the grounds by which they have been influenced. These I can only gather from the critical apparatus of Burton, the only critical edition I have seen, which is not perhaps so perfect as it might have been, owing to his death before the book was published, but, as the work of an editor who adopts the reading *λόγων*, may

be supposed to present the facts in the most favourable aspect for that reading. It appears from this that five manuscripts read *λόγων* and five *λογίων*, the latter being supported by the paraphrase of the historian Nicephorus Callisti.

The manuscripts which read *λόγων* all belong to what is called the 'other' recension, or at all events all except one, about which the statements of Burton are not sufficiently explicit to make the matter entirely free from doubt. Of the manuscripts which read *λογίων*, one designated by Burton by the letter 'A' belongs to what has been called the 'former' recension; as to the other four, he makes no statement that I can distinctly follow. As regards the authority of 'A' he makes the following remarks:—

'It exhibits a certain peculiar recension of the text, not indeed the best, as Stroth thinks, but sufficiently ancient. It often agrees with Rufinus, often also with Nicephorus, and then for the most part should be thought to exhibit the true reading, as Stroth testifies.'¹

We see that in favour of the reading *λογίων* there is this agreement of 'A' with Nicephorus, which Burton follows Stroth in acknowledging to be a general indication of the true reading, together with whatever weight ought to be assigned to the agreement of the other four codices, one of which is of the tenth century. In support, therefore, of the reading *λόγων* there appears to be the authority of one recension only, in support of *λογίων* of two recensions, or probably more.

¹ I gather from this remark that the recensions used by Rufinus and Nicephorus were different from the recension contained in 'A,' and that therefore the agreement of either of these writers with 'A' amounted to the agreement of two recensions.

If one turns from the authority of different codices to the context, the reading *λόγων* has to contend with this difficulty. It can only mean discourses, and it is not easy to see why the fact that it was not the object of Peter to make a syntax of the discourses of the Lord should be a reason why Mark should fail to relate in order what the Lord had done, as opposed to what he had said. I think I shall be able to give a meaning to the word *λογίων* which will obviate this difficulty.

CHAPTER V

THE MEANING OF THE WORD *λόγια*

THE next question to consider is the meaning to assign to the word *λόγια*, which I have translated oracles, when Papias says Matthew wrote the oracles in the Hebrew language. There can be little doubt that the oracles which Matthew wrote, or wrote on, are the same as those of which it was the object of Papias to make an exposition, as shown by the title of his work, 'An Exposition of Dominical Oracles' (*Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*), and of which Peter did not speak as if making a syntax (*οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων*).

In other words, the word *λόγιον* may be taken to be used in the same sense in all three places, the title of Papias's book, the reference to Peter, and the reference to Matthew.

As the meaning of the word *λόγιον* as used by Papias is disputed by the learned, there is little use in citing names of modern authorities for one view or the other; the only satisfactory course is to collect the passages in which the word is used by writers before and about the time of Papias.

From them we may be able to infer the meaning

of the word at that time, and consequently the meaning we ought to give it in Papias.

The first authority to refer to is undoubtedly the LXX, which did more than anything else to form the ecclesiastical Greek.

By the aid of Kircher's Concordance, I have been able to find the word *λόγιον* in twenty-six passages in the LXX,¹ of which fourteen occur in the 119th Psalm. The meaning is always 'word,' and except in one passage it is clearly applied to the word of God, by which I do not mean that the word *λόγιον* standing alone is used to mean the word of God, but that it is used in such phrases as *λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου*, &c., in which the context requires that it should have that signification. The one place where it might possibly have another application is in the 14th verse of the 19th Psalm: 'Let the words (*λόγια*) of my mouth &c. be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord.'

It is, therefore, impossible in the English version to distinguish the places in which the LXX uses '*λόγιον*' from the places in which it uses '*λόγος*.'

Thus in the 119th Psalm, verses 147 and 148:—

'I prevented the dawning of the morning, and cried: I hoped in thy words.

'Mine eyes prevent the night watches, that I might meditate in thy word.'

As rendered in the LXX, 'thy words' is represented by *τοὺς λόγους σου*, and 'thy word' by *τὰ λόγια σου*. So in Isaiah xxviii. 13th and 14th verses:—

'Therefore shall the word of the Lord be unto them precept upon precept,' &c.

¹ For a list of these passages see Appendix II.

'Wherefore bear the word of the Lord, ye scornful men.'

The 'word of the Lord,' where it first occurs, is represented in the LXX by τὰ λόγια του Θεού, and when it occurs the second time by λόγον Κυρίου.¹

The next authority to which I would refer is Philo Judaeus.

Richter, in the preface to his edition of the works of Philo Judaeus, promised his readers that he would add an index of words to the sixth volume; that promise, however, was not kept,² and I am not aware that any one has ever made such an index. In order, therefore, to ascertain the use made by Philo of the word λόγιον, I can only cite such passages as I can lay hands on.

He sometimes uses it in the same sense as the LXX, meaning generally, inspired words or revelations. Thus in his 'Life of Moses' (lib. iii. cap. 21), speaking of Moses, he says: 'He had chosen his brother high priest, according to the oracles revealed to him' (κατὰ τὰ χρησθέντα λόγια).

So again in his treatise 'On Nobility,' cap. 5, speaking of the oldest of the nation of the Jews, by whom, I suppose, is intended Abraham:—

'At the same time also oracles revealed to him (λόγια τὰ χρησθέντα) fanned up the more the desire he had to know that which is (τὸ ὄν), guided by which (the oracles) he went with most fearless zeal in search of the one (τοῦ ἐνός).'

But more usually, where Philo uses the word, he

¹ Possibly these passages show that the LXX applies λόγια to the written, λόγος to a spoken word.

² At least I cannot find any such index in my copy (Lipsii sumtibus E. B. Schwickerti, 1828).

intends specially the Old Testament Scriptures, or some part of them. Thus in the 'Life of Moses' (lib. iii. cap. 23), having described Moses as the most approved of prophets (δοκιμώτατος), he goes on to say:—

'I am not, indeed, ignorant that all things which have been written in the sacred books are revelations (χρησμοὶ) revealed through him. But first having said that, I will speak with more particularity, for of his oracles (τῶν λογίων) some are spoken in the person of God, through the divine prophet as an interpreter, others were delivered by question and answer, others in the person of Moses inspired and possessed.'

Here by his oracles Philo means the books of the Old Testament ascribed to Moses.

Again in his book 'Concerning Rewards and Punishments,' cap. 1, Philo says:—

'It has happened, then, that there are three kinds of the oracles (λογίων) through the prophet Moses, some about the making of the world, others historical, and the third class legislative.'

Here again the reference is to the Old Testament Scriptures.

Again in his work 'Concerning Meeting for Seeking Knowledge,' cap. 24, we have: 'An oracle (λόγιον), in which it is said "The Lord himself is his lot," pledges me the promise,' where the word is applied to a text from Deuteronomy.

Again in his book 'On Fugitives,' cap. 11, we find:—

'But there is also an oracle (λόγιον) revealed upon him (Cain) to this effect, 'The Lord God set a mark on Cain, lest any one finding him should kill him.'

Here we find the word applied to a text from Genesis.

Again, in his book¹ 'On a Contemplative Life,' cap. 3, speaking of the Therapeutae, he says:—

'But in each dwelling is a temple which is called a holy place and a place for retirement (*μοναστήριον*), in which, being alone, they fulfil the offices (*μυστήρια*) of the holy life, not taking in anything, either food or drink or anything else necessary for the wants of the body, but laws and oracles (*λόγια*) uttered by prophets, and hymns and the other things by which knowledge and piety are increased and fulfilled.'

There can be no doubt from the context that these Therapeutae were Jews, though of a very Hellenising turn. They meet for religious exercises and rest from work on the seventh day. They are described as the pupils of Moses (*οἱ Μωϋσέως γνῶριμοι*). Taking up the sacred Scriptures, they philosophise, making an allegory of their national philosophy (*τὴν πατρίων φιλοσοφίαν ἀλληγοροῦντες*). There can be no doubt, therefore, that the *λόγια*, or oracles, before referred to, mean some part of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Again, Philo calls the Ten Commandments the Ten Oracles (*τῶν δέκα λογίων*). This he does at least three times, once in the title of his book 'De specialibus legibus quae referuntur ad duo decalogi capita sextum septimumque &c.,' once in the second chapter of the same book, and again in the title of his book 'De Decalogo' (*Περὶ τῶν δέκα λογίων ἃ κεφάλαια νόμων εἰσὶ*). Again, at the very commencement of the former

¹ Some authorities dispute the genuineness of this book, but as I think without reason. See, further, Appendix iii.

book, Philo speaks of himself as at one time 'always moving among Divine oracles and ordinances' (*ἀεὶ θείοις λόγοις συγκινούμενος καὶ δόγμασιν*), where, no doubt, the Old Testament Scriptures are meant.

In other places Philo uses the word *λόγιον* of things contained in the Old Testament but not intended to have been cited from it by the persons of whom he is speaking. Thus in the 'Life of Moses,' book i. chapter 15, in narrating the journey of Moses to Egypt after the incident of the burning bush, he says: 'He persuades his brother to accompany him, having repeated the Divine oracles' (*τὰ θεῖα λόγια*). Here the Divine oracles are to be found in Exodus, but Philo does not intend that Exodus was then written or that Moses cited them out of it. So, again, in book iii. chapter 35 of the same work, he says: 'But the Father thoroughly established the oracle (*λόγιον*) of the prophet by two very clear proofs.' The oracle here is the command of Moses taken from Exodus xvi. 19: 'Let no man leave of it till the morning.' But it is referred to as spoken by Moses, not as cited from Exodus. A little further on, chapter 36, he says: 'Not long after, being inspired, he (Moses) utters a second oracle (*λόγιον*), the one about the holy seventh day,' and again, after remarking that men were then ignorant of the natural pre-eminence of the seventh day, Philo proceeds: 'Which being unknown he (Moses), being inspired, showed by an oracle (*λογίῳ*), which was borne witness to by a clear sign.' The oracle here referred to is the statement of Moses contained in the same chapter of Exodus that the sabbath is a holy rest, and the clear sign the not finding the manna in the field on the seventh day. Again, in chapter 38 Philo proceeds:—

'But I have a more significant oracle (λόγιον) to report . . . which he himself uttered, being again inspired, and which was accomplished not a long time afterwards, but immediately when it was being delivered.'

Philo proceeds to narrate the story of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram; the words spoken by Moses (Numbers xvi. 28-38) being much paraphrased, and in particular Moses being made to say in verse 29: 'then I have fabricated the oracles' (τὰ λόγια) instead of 'then the Lord hath not sent me.'

In all these passages Philo applies the word λόγιον to what he himself derives from the Old Testament Scriptures, though he does not intend to represent the persons to whose utterances he applies it as having so derived it.

We see, therefore, that, in fifteen out of the seventeen passages containing the word λόγιον I have been able to find in the writings of Philo, the word is applied to the Old Testament Scriptures or what is contained in them. It will be noticed that in both passages in which Philo does not intend the Old Testament Scriptures he uses the adjective χρησθέντα, revealed, showing that by the word λόγια standing alone the Old Testament Scriptures or something contained in them would be intended.

I will next consider the use of the word in the New Testament.

The word λόγιον occurs in the New Testament in four places; thus in Acts vii. 38 it is said of Moses: 'This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers, who received living oracles (λόγια ζώντα) to give unto us;' and

again, Romans iii. 2, it is said of the Jews: 'They were entrusted with the oracles of God' (τὰ λόγια Θεοῦ); and again, Hebrews v. 12:—

'For when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God' (τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ).

In all these places the word refers to the Old Testament Scriptures, or some part of them.

The remaining passage is 1 Peter iv. 11:—

'According as each has received a gift, ministering it amongst yourselves as good stewards of the manifold grace of God; if any man speaketh as oracles of God (ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ); if any man ministereth as of the strength which God supplieth; that in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ.'

I have ventured here to keep a little closer to the original than either the old or revised version. I understand the meaning to be that if any one has the gift (χάρισμα) of speech, he is to attribute it to Divine inspiration, and so give God the glory.

In this case, therefore, the word λόγια would not be applied specially to the Old Testament, but to any oracles inspired by God.

The next author I will consider is the historian Flavius Josephus.

His 'Jewish War' is certainly later in date than the Epistle to the Romans, but possibly earlier than any of the other New Testament books I have cited. As, however, the dates of these books are uncertain, I take him in this place.

He uses the word λόγιον twice in the following

passage in his 'Jewish War,' book vi. cap. 5. 4, which I cite from Whiston's translation:—

Now, if any one consider these things, he will find that God takes care of mankind, and by all ways possible foreshows to our race what is for their preservation, but that men perish by those miseries which they madly and voluntarily bring upon themselves; for the Jews, by demolishing the tower of Antonia, had made their temple foursquare, while at the same time they had it written in their sacred oracles (ἐν τοῖς λογίοις ἔχοντες) that then should their city be taken, as well as their holy house, when once their temple should become foursquare. But now what did most elevate them in undertaking this war was an ambiguous oracle that was also found in their sacred writings (χρησμός ἀμφίβολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐρημένος γράμμασιν), how, about that time, one from their country should become governor of the habitable earth. The Jews took this prediction to belong to themselves in particular, and many of the wise men were thereby deceived in their determination. Now this oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed Emperor in Judea (ἄρα περὶ τοῦ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ τὸ λόγιον ἡγεμονίαν ἀποδειχθέντος ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίας αὐτοκράτορος).

The first prophecy referred to I presume to be that contained in Ezekiel xlii. 15 to xliii. 3, which, according to the Revised Version, is as follows:—

'Now, when he had made an end of measuring the inner house, he brought me forth by the way of the gate, whose prospect is towards the east, and measured it round about. He measured on the east side with the measuring reed, five hundred reeds with the measuring reed round about. He measured on the north side five hundred reeds with the measuring reed round about. He measured on the south side five hundred reeds with the measuring reed. He turned about to the west side, and measured five hundred

reeds with the measuring reed. He measured it on the four sides. It had a wall round about, the length five hundred and the breadth five hundred, to make a separation between that which was holy and that which was common. Afterwards he brought me to the gate, even the gate that looketh toward the east, and behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east, and his voice was like the sound of many waters, and the earth shined with his glory, and it was according to the appearance of the vision that I saw when I came to destroy the city.'

Instead of the words 'when I came to destroy the city,' the Vulgate has '*quando venit ut disperderet civitatem*' ('when he came to destroy the city'). These words must indicate either a possible rendering of the Hebrew or else a different reading current in ancient times.

If we substitute them for the words of the English version, we get what reads very like a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem consequent upon the ascertainment that the temple was exactly square. Of course, when the whole passage is looked at, this does not appear to have been the meaning of Ezekiel. But as prophecies were interpreted in the days of Josephus, and for that matter are often still interpreted, such a sense would very likely be put upon it.

The other prophecy is generally supposed to be the famous prophecy of the seventy weeks, contained in Daniel ix. The same process by which Christians have applied this prophecy to Jesus of Nazareth would excite in the Jews the expectation of some other Messiah a few years afterwards. Whatever opinions, however, be entertained as to the particular passages Josephus had in view, there can be no doubt that by the words ἐν τοῖς λογίοις he meant 'in the Old Testa-

ment Scriptures,' and by the words τὸ λογίον a particular prophecy contained in them.

This is the only passage I have been able to find in Josephus which contains the word *λόγιον*.

It will be noticed that the word as used by him has more the sense of prophecy than as used by Philo, and, bearing in mind that he was a man of affairs while Philo was a philosopher, this is probably an indication of the more common use of the word among Greek-speaking Jews.

Clement of Rome, whom I will now consider, uses the word four, or, at all events, three, times.

The first place is in chapter 13, but as there the word occurs in a quotation and there is, moreover, a difference of reading, I will for the present pass it over.

The second place is in chapter 19, in which, after quoting largely from the fifty-first Psalm, concluding with the words 'a sacrifice unto God is a contrite spirit, a contrite and humbled heart God will not despise' (I quote from the translation of Dr. Light-foot), he continues:—

'The humility, therefore, and the submissiveness of so many and so great men, who have thus obtained a good report, hath through obedience made better not only us but also the generations which were before us, even them that received His oracles in fear and truth (οὐ μόνον ἡμᾶς ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς πρὸ ἡμῶν γενεὰς βελτίους ἐποίησαν, τοὺς τε καταδεξαμένους τὰ λόγια αὐτοῦ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ).'

The oracles (τὰ λόγια) from which the generations before Clement as well as his own generation had received benefit are here evidently the Old Testament Scriptures.

The passage quoted above follows notices of Elijah, Elisha, Ezekiel, Abraham, Job, Moses, and David.

The next passage where Clement uses the word is in chapter 53, and runs thus, according to the same translation:—

'For ye know and know well the sacred Scriptures, dearly beloved, and ye have searched into the oracles of God (καὶ ἐγκεκύφατε εἰς τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ). We write these things, therefore, to put you in remembrance. When Moses went up into the mountain, and had spent forty days and forty nights in fasting and humiliation, God said unto him,' &c.

Here again the word oracles (*λόγια*) evidently refers to the Old Testament.

The portion of the Epistle of Clement following the last quotation is full of quotations from the canonical and apocryphal books of the Old Testament; in particular mention is made of the preservation of Israel by reason of the intercession and self-sacrifice of Moses, Judith, and Esther. In chapter 62, Clement again uses the word *λόγια* in the following passage:—

'We have written fully unto you, brethren, . . . putting you in remembrance that ye ought to please Almighty God . . . even as our fathers, of whom we spoke before, pleased Him . . . and as we have put you in mind of these things the more gladly since we knew well that we were writing to men who are faithful and highly accounted, and have diligently searched into the oracles of the teaching of God (ἐγκεκυφώσιν εἰς τὰ λόγια τῆς παιδείας τοῦ Θεοῦ).'

Here, again, it is plain that the word oracles (*λόγια*) refers to the Old Testament.

I will now return to the passage which I passed

over and which presents more difficulty. It is therefore necessary to cite it at length:—

‘Let us, therefore, be lowly-minded, brethren, laying aside all arrogance and conceit and folly and anger, and let us do that which is written (τὸ γεγραμμένον). For the Holy Ghost saith, Let not the wise man boast in his wisdom, nor the strong in his strength, neither the rich in his riches; but he that boasteth let him boast in the Lord, that he may seek Him out, and do judgment and righteousness; most of all remembering the words (τῶν λόγων) of the Lord Jesus which He spake (οὗς ἐλάλησεν), teaching (διδάσκων) forbearance and long-suffering: for thus He spake (οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν), Have mercy, that ye may receive mercy; forgive, that it may be forgiven to you. As ye do, so shall it be done to you. As ye give, so shall it be given unto you. As ye judge, so shall ye be judged. As ye show kindness, so shall kindness be showed unto you. With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured withal to you. With this commandment and these precepts (ταύτη τῇ ἐντολῇ καὶ τοῖς παραγγέλμασιν) let us confirm ourselves, that we may walk in obedience to His hallowed words (τοῖς ἁγιοπρεπέσι λόγοις αὐτοῦ) with lowliness of mind. For the holy word saith, Upon whom shall I look save upon him that is gentle and quiet and feareth mine oracles (μου τὰ λόγια)?’

The first remark to make upon this passage is that the word *λόγια* occurs in a quotation from Isaiah lxvi. 2. This quotation is made nearly in the words of the LXX, but instead of the words *μου τὰ λόγια* the LXX has *τοὺς λόγους μου*.

In making the quotation, therefore, the word *λόγια* or ‘oracles,’ with which we are at present concerned, has been substituted for the word *λόγους*, or ‘words,’ made use of in the LXX.

The next remark to make is that, though this

is the reading of the Alexandrine MS., the Constantinopolitan MS., which is the other Greek authority for the text, agrees with the LXX. Dr. Lightfoot adopts the reading of the Alexandrine MS. on, no doubt, good grounds, for it appears that it is one of the peculiarities of the Constantinopolitan MS. to assimilate the quotations to the LXX.

It is, however, necessary to notice this variation of reading, for if the reading of the Constantinopolitan MS. were adopted the word *λόγια* would not occur in the passage at all.

Assuming, then, that the reading of the Alexandrine MS. is right, we have to consider what light the passage throws upon the meaning of the word *λόγια*, and this must to a great extent turn upon the motive which induced Clement to depart from the language of the LXX.

It is possible, but not very probable, that the particular text which he used may have had the reading. If that were the case, the passage would be consistent either with the application of the word to the quotations from the Old Testament or to the words of Jesus, and would, therefore, not assist us much. But supposing, what is more probable, that Clement intentionally altered the word, we get a more distinct indication of its meaning. For if he had made the citation in the words of the LXX, ‘Upon whom shall I look save upon him that is gentle and quiet and feareth my words?’ (*τοὺς λόγους μου*), the application of the quotation to the words of Jesus would have been necessary. It would, therefore, appear probable that it was in order to obviate this application that he substituted the word oracles (*λόγια*) and in consequence

that the use of the word at that time, in the absence of a controlling context, was not consistent with its application to anything else than the Old Testament. This would agree with the use made by Clement of the word *λόγια* in the other three places in which he uses it. It may be asked, Why should Clement desire to avoid the application of the citation to the words of Jesus? One answer might be that in so doing, though he altered the language, he preserved the sense of the document he was citing. Having regard to the wresting of the language of texts which was common at that day (though I have not noticed that Clement is chargeable with it), this reason may not be of great weight.

Another reason that suggests itself is that in the LXX the words cited are put into the mouth of the Lord (*Κύριος*). Now, there was a school in the Church which contended that the word *Κύριος*, where it occurs in the LXX, referred to the second person of the Trinity as opposed to the first, and Clement, by making the citation apply to the words of Jesus, would be adopting the doctrine of this school. This Clement may not have wished to do. His object in writing his epistle was to inculcate, not any abstract doctrine, but the practical duty of obedience to the constituted authorities in the Church. He had before him a great object, no less than the building up of that vast edifice of ecclesiastical dominion which has overshadowed the earth. To have put forward any doctrine which, without forwarding his main aim, might have proved offensive to any class of his readers, would have been foreign to his purpose. By confining the application of the passage to the Old Testament,

to which nobody would dispute it was applicable, he avoided a possible cause of offence. But without any such special object the use of the word 'oracles' may simply indicate a return to the sentiment with which the chapter commences:—

' . . . let us do that which is written. . . . For the holy word saith, Upon whom shall I look save upon him that . . . feareth mine oracles? Therefore it is right and proper, brethren, that we should be obedient unto God,' &c.

When, therefore, this passage is looked into, it affords evidence of the special application of the word *λόγια* to the Old Testament Scriptures. We see, therefore, that Clement of Rome, in the four places in which he uses the word *λόγια*, intends by it the Old Testament. This is the more noticeable because in another place, as well as in the passage above cited, he quotes words of Jesus, calling them *λόγοι*, not *λόγια*.

It must be noticed that, besides applying to them the term oracles (*λόγια*), Clement uses many formulas of respect in citing the Old Testament, *e.g.* 'it is written' (*γέγραπται*), cc. 4, 13, 17, 29, 36, 39, 46, 48, 50; 'the writing' (*τὸ γραφεῖον*) saith,' c. 28; 'the scripture' (*ἡ γραφή*) saith,' cc. 34, 35; 'the Holy Ghost' (*τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*) saith,' cc. 13, 16, 22; 'the holy word saith' (*φησὶν ὁ ἅγιος λόγος*), cc. 13, 56; 'the All-virtuous Wisdom saith' (*λέγει ἡ πανάρετος σοφία*), c. 57, while he uses no similar phraseology in citing books of the New Testament. This indicates clearly that the writer did not think fit to accord to the New Testament that position which was held by the Old Testament; and when we realise the official nature of the letter written in the name of the Church

of Rome to the Church of Corinth, and the practical object it had in view, we may take this as an index to the usage generally prevalent in the Church at that day.

The Epistle of Clement, therefore, affords a strong argument against applying to any book in the New Testament any of the phraseology which had been customarily used to indicate the Old Testament Canon, in any book written before the second century was well advanced.

Justin Martyr, whom I will next consider, as I find by the index of Otto, uses the word twice. In one place he applies the word *λόγιον* to a passage in the Old Testament, which, he contends, was a prophecy fulfilled in Jesus. In the other place, he calls sayings of Jesus *λόγια*; but though he often quotes evangelical writings of some sort, he never refers to them as *λόγια*. So in other places where he has to mention sayings of Jesus, he calls them *λόγοι*, not *λόγια*, as in the well-known passage, 'Short and concise were his words (*λόγοι*), for he was no sophist.' The first passage in which Justin uses the word *λόγιον* is in his first Apology, chapter 32, and is as follows:—

'And Isaiah also, another prophet, prophesying the same things in other language, thus said: "A star shall rise out of Jacob, and a flower shall go up from the root of Jesse, and in his arm shall the Gentiles hope." And a bright star arose, and a flower went up from the root of Jesse, this Christ. For by the virgin who was of the seed of Jacob, who was the father of Judah, who has been shown to be the father of the Jews, through the power of God he was brought forth, and Jesse has become his forefather, according to the oracle (*κατὰ τὸ λόγιον*); and of Jacob and Judah, by successive descent, he was a son.'

Many remarks might be made upon this passage, and may have to be made before we have done, but one thing is certain, that Justin applies the word 'oracle' (*λόγιον*) to a text, or rather texts, which he supposes to come out of Isaiah, and which are, in fact, contained in the Old Testament.

The second place in which Justin uses the word is in his 'Dialogue with Trypho,' chapter xviii. He has wound up a series of citations from the Old Testament, and passes on to quote certain words of Jesus, which, he says, he cried out on the occasion of his overthrowing the tables of the money-changers in the Temple, and which, with some differences, resemble a mixture of sayings stated in Matthew to have been uttered by Jesus in the Temple on a subsequent occasion, with other sayings stated in Luke to have been uttered by Jesus when at dinner in a Pharisee's house—'Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, &c.' Justin then proceeds as follows:—

'For since, Trypho, you have read, as you yourself acknowledge, the things which were taught by that Saviour of ours, I do not think that I have acted out of place in adding short oracles (*λόγια*) of his to those of the prophets.'

The application of the word in this place to the sayings of Jesus is of course clear, but it does not indicate a usual use of the word. On the contrary, its unusual application to the denunciations of Jesus gives the passage its force, being in the nature of a hit at Trypho.

This last citation from Justin, which is at least fifty years subsequent to the date I have assigned to Papias, is the earliest passage extant in which the word *λόγιον* is applied in any way to the New Testa-

ment Scriptures, and it is noteworthy that in this case it is applied merely to the sayings of Jesus, and not to the books which contain them; and that even so, the context tends to show that the use of the word was at the time unusual.

The word occurs again in the Epistle to the Philippians, attributed to Polycarp, c. vii. I quote the passage from Dr. Lightfoot's translation:—

'Let us, therefore, so serve Him with fear and all reverence, as He Himself gave commandment, and the Apostles who preached the Gospel to us, and the prophets who proclaimed beforehand the coming of our Lord, being zealous as touching that which is good, abstaining from offences, and from the false brethren, and from them that bear the name of the Lord in hypocrisy, who lead foolish men astray.

'For everyone who shall not confess that Jesus is come in the flesh is antichrist, and whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord (*τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου*) to his own lusts, and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the firstborn of Satan.'

This version follows the extant Greek manuscripts, but an extract contained in the work of an old Syriac writer has preserved the reading 'oracles of God' instead of 'oracles of the Lord.' Now, to quote the words of Dr. Lightfoot, 'the extant Greek manuscripts have all descended from one faulty and, probably, not very early archetype.'¹ Their authority is, therefore, not at all high, even when, as in the present case, they agree with the Latin version, for the two again—to quote Dr. Lightfoot—'are closely allied.'²

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. p. 531.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii. sect. ii. p. 901.

It will, therefore, be doubtful whether the older reading is not that preserved by the old Syriac writer.

Whichever reading be adopted, there will be seen to be a parallelism in the passage I have quoted, which will point with sufficient clearness to what was intended by the word *λόγια*.

Let us, therefore, serve Him as He himself gave us commandment.	For everyone who shall not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is antichrist.
---	--

And the Apostles who preached the Gospel to us.	And whosoever shall not confess the testimony of the Cross is of the devil.
---	---

And the prophets who proclaimed beforehand the coming of our Lord.	And whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord (or God) to his own lusts, and say there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the firstborn of Satan.
--	--

Observing this parallelism, it is plain that by 'the oracles of the Lord (or God)' were intended the Old Testament Scriptures.

If the reading 'of (concerning) the Lord' be adopted, the intendment will be the Messianic prophecies; if the reading 'of God,' the Old Testament Scriptures generally.

The same follows from the consideration of the passage itself, for the doctrine condemned, denying the resurrection and the judgment, was that of the Sadducees, and was not held, so far as I am aware, by any sect of Christians.

I have pointed out that the context compels the same intendment to be given to *λόγια*, whether we

adopt the reading *Κυρίου* or *Θεοῦ*; but it must be noticed that if we suppose the original reading to have been *Κυρίου*, the change to *Θεοῦ* points to a difficulty in the sense, and that just such a difficulty would be occasioned by a change in the usual intendment of the phrase *λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου* from Messianic prophecies to New Testament Scriptures. If, therefore, *Κυρίου* be the true reading, the existence of the various reading is favourable to the true reading requiring an archaic interpretation of the passage.

Dr. Lightfoot, who holds the epistle of Polycarp to be genuine, places the date of it A.D. 110. Being inclined myself to consider it spurious, I should place its date shortly after the time when, the name of Polycarp having acquired great weight by his martyrdom, it was considered desirable to provide evidence of his adhesion to the teaching of the apostle Paul. That is some time in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, or not many years before Irenaeus wrote his work on heresies.

The word *λόγιον* occurs again in the ancient homily, commonly known as the second epistle of Clement, chapter xiii., which I quote from Dr. Lightfoot's translation:—

‘Therefore, brethren, let us repent forthwith. Let us be sober unto that which is good; for we are full of mad folly and wickedness. Let us wipe away from us our former sins, and let us repent with our whole soul and be saved, and let us not be found men-pleasers. Neither let us desire to please one another only, but also those men that are without, by our righteousness, that the Name be not blasphemed by reason of us. For the Lord saith (λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος), *Every way My Name is blasphemed among all the Gentiles*; and again, *Woe unto him by reason of whom My Name is blasphemed*. Wherein is it blasphemed? In

that ye do not the things which I desire. For the Gentiles, when they hear from our mouth the oracles of God (τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ), marvel at them for their beauty and greatness; then, when they discover our works are not worthy of the words which we speak, forthwith they betake themselves to blasphemy, saying that it is an idle story and a delusion. For when they hear from us that God (ὁ Θεός) saith, It is no thank unto you if ye love them that love you, but this is thank unto you, if ye love your enemies and them that hate you (Οὐ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ἀλλὰ χάρις ὑμῖν εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καὶ τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς); when they hear these things, I say, they marvel at their exceeding goodness; but when they see that we do not only not love them that hate us, but not even them that love us, they laugh us to scorn, and the Name is blasphemed.’

The passage, quoted as an oracle of God, may possibly be an abridged and rather free rendering of Luke vi. 32-35:—

‘If ye love them that love you, what thank have ye? . . . But love your enemies . . . and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High (εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; . . . πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν . . . καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου).’

But, if not, it probably comes from some other gospel.

We have, therefore, the word *λόγιον* applied to words put into the mouth of Jesus in some gospel; this, however, is a very different thing from so describing the gospel which contained those words. The usage of the word is, therefore, similar to that by Justin Martyr in the passage quoted above from the Dialogue with Trypho, with the exception that there is nothing in the context to suggest that it was uncommon.

In considering the importance to be attached to this quotation it is necessary to consider the date of the homily in which it occurs.

The first notice we have of it is in the 'Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius' (iii. 38), who appears to have doubted its genuineness, and says that he did not know of any mention of it by ancient writers. Nevertheless, the archaic style of reference to evangelical literature, especially the quotation of sayings of Jesus, contained only in apocryphal gospels, without any note that they were of doubtful authority, shows the homily to be of a date anterior to the time at which the four canonical gospels came to be regarded as of peculiar authority. This archaic style of reference is one ground why Dr. Lightfoot fixes the date as early as the second quarter of the second century.¹ This is by comparing the style of its author in such matters with Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, and assuming that the style of the two latter writers may be taken as typical of what would be tolerated in the church at their age. This, however, I venture to contend, is a mistake. These writers were leaders of opinion, and were forerunners of the age that followed them, rather than representatives of their own. The quotation from Dr. Lightfoot's own writings in the case of the acts of the Scillitan martyrs cited below² will show that the archaic way of referring to New Testament writings continued as late as the accession of Commodus, A.D. 180.

There can be no reason, therefore, on this ground, to refer the homily we are now considering to an earlier date.

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. ii. p. 202.

² P. 79, *post*.

The other ground alleged by Dr. Lightfoot is, that the homily contains expressions which might be thought to savour of Valentinianism, notably the reference to the spiritual church begotten before the sun and moon, and that an orthodox writer would have avoided such expressions after the Valentinian system had been promulgated and publicly branded as heresy.¹ But Dr. Lightfoot has to admit that it is not certain that the writer of the homily was reckoned altogether orthodox in his own day, and even if he were, the system of Valentinus was not one which succumbed immediately it had been pronounced to be heretical. On the contrary, it troubled the church for several generations, and was in the end embraced by a large sect. The philosophical principles upon which the system of Valentinus was based were prevalent among a large number of the thinking men of the second century, and it was not until those principles were discredited by the revived Platonism of Plotinus, that the system based on them began to give way. There is therefore no reason to think that principles more or less approximating to those of Valentinus were less rife in the church in the generation succeeding the promulgation of his doctrines than they had been in the generation before. We must therefore look for some other grounds than those alleged by Dr. Lightfoot if we would place the homily earlier than the latter part of the second century. I am not aware of any. The best indication of the date of the homily which I am aware of, is to be found in the following passage from cap. xvii., which I cite from the translation of Dr. Lightfoot:—

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. p. 203.

'But the righteous, having done good and endured torments (*ὑπομείναντες τὰς βασάνους*), and hated the pleasures of the soul, when they shall behold them that have done amiss, and denied Jesus by their words or by their deeds, how that they are punished with grievous torments in an unquenchable fire, shall give glory to God (*ἔσονται δόξαν διδόντες τῷ Θεῷ αὐτῶν*), saying there will be hope for him that has served God with his whole heart.'

This part of the text is extant in two authorities only, the Greek MS., known as the Constantinopolitan, and the Syriac version.

The Syriac version, one of these authorities, adds *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει* after *ἔσονται*, making the redeemed 'in exceeding joy' give glory to their God at the sight of the sufferings of the lost.

In the parts of the text which are extant also in the Alexandrine MS., which is deemed the best authority, the Syriac version most frequently coincides with Alexandrine MS., where it differs from the Constantinopolitan MS.¹

Upon the merits of this version as an authority, as contrasted with the Constantinopolitan manuscript denoted by the symbol C which forms the remaining authority, Dr. Lightfoot remarks as follows:—

'Of the two inferior authorities, S (the Syriac version) is much more valuable than C for correcting A (the Alexandrian MS.). While C alone corrects A in one passage only of any moment, S alone corrects it in several. In itself, S is both better and worse than C. It is made up of two elements, one very ancient and good, the other debased and probably recent, whereas C preserves a pretty fair standard throughout.'²

¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. p. 138. ² *Ibid.* p. 144.

This character of the two witnesses C and S would seem to show a preponderance in favour of the reading supported by the Syriac version, especially when one recollects the tendency there would be to omit *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει* in order to soften the harshness of the sentiment, and that C shows signs of critical revision.¹

Dr. Lightfoot gives as his reason for preferring the reading of the Constantinopolitan MS. in this place that the addition of the words *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει* should be taken as an illustration of a tendency to introduce glosses and explanations characteristic of the Syriac version, or the Greek MS. from which it was derived,² but we may suspect that he was influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by a desire to soften the passage. This we see in his translation cited above, where, by omitting to translate *αὐτῶν* and so making the saints give glory 'to God' instead of to 'their God,' he makes a further change in the same direction.

But whether this expletive ought or ought not to be part of the text, the passage shows a great bitterness of feeling on the part of the Christians towards unbelievers, and following the previous quotation in which the preacher had pointed out how the Name was blasphemed, owing to the disregard, on the part of the Christians, of the divine injunction concerning loving their enemies, would have appeared in the nature of a practical bull, had not the outrageousness of the sentiment been disguised by its having become a religious commonplace. It is well known that it finally became an established doctrine of the church, that the redeemed would witness the sufferings of the

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. p. 124. ² *Ibid.* p. 141.

damned and derive pleasure from so doing,¹ and we see that this doctrine had already taken root at the time of the composition of this homily. Now we may be certain that this sentiment, so contrary to the express teaching of the gospel, would not become general, except in the minds of people embittered by a widespread and persistent persecution. A state of widespread persecution, either existing or in recent memory, is further implied in the reference to the having endured torments, as part of the common lot of the redeemed.

Such a persecution the Christians did not have to contend with until the reign of Marcus Aurelius, commencing A.D. 161.

Some time after that date, say about A.D. 170, is therefore the earliest probable date to which the composition of the homily we are considering can be assigned. Taking this as the date of the homily, it is too late to be of consequence for the purpose we have in hand, that is, of showing the usage of the word *λόγιον* before the age of Irenaeus. But even if an earlier date be assigned, it is an example of the application of the word to words supposed to have been spoken by Jesus, not to the document which contained them.

In Irenaeus, who wrote in the generation after Justin, and later than any of the works I have cited, with the possible exception of the second epistle of Clement, the books of the Old and New Testament are indifferently called *λόγια* or oracles.

¹ The peroration of Tertullian to his treatise *De Spectaculis* is a familiar expression of this doctrine in ancient times, but for the matured opinion of the Catholic Church see the commentary of Aquinas on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, Lib. IV. Distinctio L. Quaestio ii. articulus iv. solutio i.: 'Respondeo dicendum . . . quod a beatis nihil subtrahi debet quod ad perfectionem beatitudinis pertineat. . . . Dantur eis ut poenam impiorum perfecte intueantur.'

It will be noticed that the meanings of the word *λόγια* appear to have been subject to a regular development. The primary meaning appears to be inspired words or oracles. When used by Jewish monotheists as in the LXX, it becomes confined to the words of the one God they worshipped. Subsequently, the whole of the books of the Old Testament canon being supposed to be inspired by God, the word became specialised to signify that canon, or anything contained in it, as constituting the whole of the inspired word of God, whether said to be expressly spoken by God or not, and this continued for a long time the ordinary use of the word in Christian writings.

When books began to be circulated among Christians purporting to narrate the sayings of Jesus, the word *λόγια* was after a time extended to such sayings, as we see it was by Justin Martyr in one instance only, though not by Clement of Rome. Finally when the books themselves which contained those words came to be reckoned canonical Scripture and inspired, the name *λόγια* was extended to the books and all that was in them, as appears to have been the case by Irenaeus.

Now the question is, in what sense was the word used by Papias?

As far as I know, the foregoing citations contain all the passages that are material for determining this question. No doubt a larger number of places might be found in which the word occurs in the works of Philo, but I do not suppose they would affect the question.

The passages I have cited may be divided into three classes, as they show the usage of

- (1) The LXX translators.
- (2) Greek Jews subsequent to the LXX.
- (3) Christian writers.

(1) The usage of the LXX is material, not merely as originally giving the word its ecclesiastical meaning, but as exercising a powerful influence in determining that meaning among all Greek Christians, who continued to use that version. The meaning 'inspired word,' adopted by that version, does not appear ever to have been departed from, though what would be intended by 'inspired word' varied from time to time.

(2) The usage of Philo and Josephus is material as showing that at the time of the introduction of Christianity the Greek Jews by 'the inspired word' usually intended the Old Testament Scriptures, though they sometimes used the word in the more general sense of the LXX.

(3) I have been able to find eleven or perhaps twelve passages in which the word is used by Christian writers other than Papias before the age of Irenaeus, i.e.:-

Paul	1
Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews	1
" " first Epistle of Peter	1
Clement of Rome	4
Writer of the Acts	1
Justin :	2
Writer of the Epistle of Polycarp	1
" " second Epistle of Clement	1
	12

In one of these passages, that is in 1 Peter, the word is used in the general sense of the LXX, and in

two others, one in Justin, at least a generation after Papias, and one in 2nd Clement still later, it is applied to the words of Jesus.

In the other nine passages the Old Testament Scriptures are intended. We see, therefore, that Christians continued to use the word with the same intendment in which it had been used by the Greek Jews, until the middle of the second century or later.

The first instance in which we find it used to intend the books of the New Testament is in Irenaeus, who cannot reasonably be supposed to have written before A.D. 180, that is more than eighty years after the date I have assigned to the work of Papias, and fifty years after the latest date that could reasonably be assigned to that work.

Now in most cases fifty or even eighty years would be a small matter in the history of a word. It is far otherwise when one is considering the language likely to be applied to a book in the New Testament canon, and those fifty or eighty years occur while that canon was gathering authority during the second century. That this is the case I will show by the authority of Dr. Lightfoot, the late Bishop of Durham. Arguing in favour of the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles, he says :¹—

'A primary test of age in an early Christian writing is the relation which the notices of the words and deeds of Christ and his Apostles bear to the canonical writings. Tried by this test, the Ignatian epistles proclaim their early date. There is no sign whatever in them of a canon or authoritative collection of books of the New Testament. The expression "It is written" (*γέγραπται*) is employed to introduce quotations from the Old Testament alone (Ephes-

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. pp. 388-389.

sians v., Magnesians xii.). In one passage it is used by Ignatius in controversy with his Judaizing opponents of the Old Testament, as distinguished from the New. In this passage the archives (*ἀρχαία*) are opposed to the gospel (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*) as the Old Testament to the New. Such language is highly archaic . . . there is not so much as a single reference to written evangelical records, such as memoirs of the Apostles, which occupy so large a place in Justin Martyr. Still less is there any quotation by name from a canonical gospel, though such quotations abound in Irenaeus. . . . I would ask any reader who desires to apprehend the full force of these arguments to read a book or two of Irenaeus continuously, and mark the contrast in the manner of dealing with the evangelical narratives and the Apostolic letters.'

Again in another place,¹ writing to establish the genuineness of the Epistle of Polycarp, he says as follows:—

'We are asked to believe that this letter was forged on the confines of the age of Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria. But how wholly unlike it is to the ecclesiastical literature of this later generation, whether we regard the use of the New Testament or the notices of the ecclesiastical order, or the statements of theological doctrine, a little consideration will show. The evangelical quotations are still introduced, as in Clement of Rome, with the formula "The Lord said;" the passages from the Apostolic epistles are still for the most part indirect and anonymous; not a single book of the New Testament is cited by name.'

In another place, speaking of the Scillitan martyrs who suffered at a town in Numidia called Scillium, or some similar name A.D. 180, just after the commencement of the reign of Commodus, he says:—

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. p. 577,

'Of the genuineness of the newly discovered Greek Acts there can be no reasonable doubt. They betray their antiquity by their mode of expression, as, for instance, when the writings which we call the New Testament are described as "the books in use among us, and in addition Epistles of Paul, the holy man" (*αἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς βιβλὸι καὶ προσεπιτούτοις ἐπιστολαὶ Παύλου τοῦ ὁσίου ἀνδρός*).'¹

Now for the purpose Dr. Lightfoot had in hand, that is, establishing the genuineness of the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, the argument in the first two extracts, so far as it is derived from the way of speaking of New Testament books, is sufficiently answered by the last extract, which shows that the archaic way of referring to them continued among some people or places right up to the age of Irenaeus. But for the converse purpose I have in hand, that is of showing that a writer who cannot be put later than the early part of the second century would not speak of New Testament books as canonical scriptures, and that therefore words in such a writer importing canonical scripture ought not of themselves to be applied to New Testament books, all three extracts are consistent and support one another.

I need not remind my readers that upon the point now before us, that is, the meaning of Papias, Dr. Lightfoot supports the view that the book mentioned by Papias is the first canonical gospel. I should, however, attach more weight to what he says upon the Ignatian controversy, upon which he may have felt more free to express his opinions as a scholar.

I must here make another remark which appears to follow from the foregoing quotations from Dr.

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. p. 508.

Lightfoot, and that is, that in his way of regarding New Testament books, Irenaeus was in advance of his age, or perhaps rather I should say, belonged to the more advanced party in the church in his age, and is therefore a better index to the opinions of the generation that succeeded him, than of the generation that went before him; which is further borne out by the preservation of his books, when so many of his contemporaries have perished.

Some further light may be thrown upon the meaning of the word *λόγια* by the way in which it was translated into Latin. The words *λόγια ζῶντα*, in Acts vii. 38, are in the Vulgate rendered by 'verba vitae,' and in codex d. (the Latin version of codex D.) 'eloquia viventium.' In the Vulgate the words *τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Romans iii. 2, are rendered 'eloquia Dei;' the words *τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Hebrews v. 12, 'elementa exordii sermonum Dei;' and the words *λόγια Θεοῦ*, in 1 Peter iv. 11, by 'sermones Dei.' Jerome renders the title of the book of Papias 'Explanatio Sermonum Domini,' and the old Latin translator of Irenaeus renders *τὰ λόγια Κυρίου*, in Lib. i. 1, by 'verba Domini;' and in Lib. i. 8, *κυριακῶν λογίων* by 'Dominicis eloquiis,' and *τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ* by 'eloquia Dei.'

In the places in which the LXX has *λόγιον*, the Vulgate has one or other of the same three words, sermo, verbum, eloquium, but for the most part the latter. As by far the greater part of the places, i.e. nineteen out of twenty-six, in which the word occurs are in the Psalms, and as Jerome's version of the Psalms was based upon the old Latin which was translated from the LXX, we have here also

evidence of the current rendering of *λόγιον* into Latin.

Rufinus, the Latin translator of Eusebius, translates the word *λόγια* by 'oracula.'¹

These are all the authorities I can just now lay my hands on for the translation of the word into Latin by ancient writers. The words by which it is rendered by other writers than Rufinus—verba, eloquia, sermones—have the meaning 'words' or 'utterances' merely, leaving any other meaning it might have, such as 'words of God,' or 'inspired words,' to be gathered from the context, though the favourite rendering by the word 'eloquium' imports the meaning of eloquent words not found in the Greek. These renderings afford evidence that the sense of 'words' or 'utterances' must be taken to be the more prominent part of the meaning, and help to discountenance any rendering in which that sense should be allowed to fall into abeyance. The rendering of Rufinus, who by the bent of his mind as well as by his training was probably the most competent of the various translators, reproduces more nearly the classical meaning of the word. It conveys the meaning of prophecies, and therefore strongly supports my contention.

¹ Tischendorf, *Wann wurden*, &c., p. 102; note 1, cited *Supernatural Religion*, complete edition, vol. i. p. 466.

CHAPTER VI

THE MEANING OF PAPIAS

THE meaning, therefore, of the extract from Papias is, 'Matthew wrote the inspired words in the Hebrew language,' the context probably implying the qualification 'of or concerning the Lord.' The question is what was the intendment. That there was some special intendment there can be no question, and we have three intendments to choose from—books or passages from the Old Testament; words of Jesus; and books or passages from the New Testament. The last is not supported by any instance earlier than two generations or upwards after the time of Papias. For words of Jesus, we have two instances a generation or more after Papias; while for the Old Testament being intended, we have nine, or, counting the citations from Philo and Josephus, twenty-six instances, including four passages in his contemporary, Clement of Rome.

I submit, therefore, there can be no doubt that by the word *λόγια* Papias should be taken to intend the Old Testament Scriptures, if that interpretation will satisfy the context. Taking this then to be so, the title of the work of Papias will be, 'An exposition of Old Testament Scriptures relating to the Lord,'

that is, of Messianic prophecies. The passage about Matthew will be, 'Matthew made a collection of the (Messianic) prophecies in the Hebrew language, or Matthew wrote on the (Messianic) prophecies in the Hebrew language, and each interpreted them as he was able.' I think the original will bear either of these constructions, but that the former is the true one. If the former construction be adopted, the word *ἡρμήνευσε* interpreted will mean 'expounded,' that is, showed how they were fulfilled; the same signification in which the cognate word *ἐρμηνείας* is used by Papias in the first extract quoted by Eusebius. If the latter construction be adopted, it will mean 'translated.'

I must now consider how the interpretation, Messianic prophecies, will apply to the phrase *κυριακῶν λογίων*, dominical oracles, in the remaining place, that is to say, what reason is it for the imperfection of Mark's work that Peter did not teach as if he were making a syntax or systematic exposition of the Messianic prophecies? The answer is, the primitive Christians were interested in the life and teaching of Jesus, not so much as an example of conduct, or for the sake of what he taught, *per se*, but as a means of proving that he was the Messiah, by showing that he fulfilled the prophecies. So much only of his life and teaching as answered that end was of considerable interest. In order, therefore, to pursue that subject thoroughly, it would be necessary systematically to narrate what was known of his life and teaching, but for no other purpose. In proof of these assertions I would refer—*First*, to the absence in any of the epistles in the New Testament of any reference to the teaching of Jesus, or of any moral drawn from

any incident in His life. *Secondly*, to the instances given in the New Testament of the opposite procedure: e.g. we read, Acts viii. 35, 'Philip . . . began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus.' Again, Acts xvii. 11, that the Jews of Berea, hearing the preaching of Paul, 'searched the scriptures daily whether these things were so;' again, Acts xviii. 28, that Apollos 'mightily convinced the Jews . . . showing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ;' again, Acts xxvi. 22, 23, Paul is made to say:—

'I stand unto this day testifying both to small and great, saying nothing but what the Prophets and Moses did say should come, how that Christ must suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light, both to the people and the Gentiles.'

Again, 1 Peter i. 9, *et seq.*:—

'Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls; concerning which salvation the prophets taught and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, teaching what time or what manner of time the spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow them. To whom it was revealed that not unto themselves but unto you did they minister these things which now have been announced unto you through them that preached the Gospel unto you.'

In all these places, and I have no doubt more could be found,¹ we have allusions to teaching of the sort I have mentioned.

¹ E.g. Luke i. 1. As Dr. Lightfoot remarks (*Colossians*, 9th edit. p. 238), there is in the usage of the word no justification for translating τῶν πεπληρορημένων ἐν ἡμῶν πραγμάτων 'those things which are most surely believed among us.' We ought, therefore, with the revised ver-

I may add that works of the kind of which that of Papias must have been, if the foregoing inferences are correct, were by no means unknown in the primitive Church. Thus Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the middle of the second century, wrote a book which he described as 'Selections from the Law and the Prophets about the Saviour and our whole faith' (ἐκλογὰς ἐκ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν).

I will now pass on to consider a peculiar statement of Irenaeus, which is not without its weight in supporting the conclusion that the work of Papias consisted of the exposition of Old Testament prophecies. There is no doubt, I think, that Irenaeus made a good deal of use of Papias, and this has been remarked especially of his fourth book, in the beginning of which he promises some proofs by the words of the Lord, *per sermones domini* in the Latin version. In the Greek 'sermones domini' was probably λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου. At all events λόγια was sometimes translated into Latin by 'sermones,' as has been shown above.

But a little further on he makes the following curious statement: 'But since the writings of Moses are the words of Christ, he himself says to the Jews, as John has recorded in his gospel: "If you had

sion, to translate 'those matters which have been fulfilled among us.' To narrate the fulfilment of prophecy would appear then to have been the object an evangelist set before him. The use of this phrase is the more peculiar in the case of Luke, as that is not the view unfolded in his gospel, the prophecies stated to be fulfilled being by him left out. Unless, therefore, his gospel underwent a revision which did not extend to the preface, it would seem that the custom of looking upon the life of Jesus as a narration of the fulfilment of prophecy had become so much a matter of course, that it would be so described by a writer who himself took a different view of it.

¹ Irenaeus, lib. iv. c. 2, s. 3.

believed Moses you would have believed me also, for he wrote of me, but if you do not believe his writings, neither will you believe my words"—most clearly signifying that the writings of Moses were his own words. Therefore, if the writings of Moses, so also the writings of the other prophets, without doubt are his own words (i.e. Christ's) as we have shown.' Now this is exactly the remark 'a man of the mental calibre of Irenaeus might be supposed to make upon finding a work entitled like that of Papias to contain an exposition of Old Testament prophecies. He would interpret the title 'An exposition of the sayings of the Lord.' It does not occur to him that Papias used the words in a different sense, and he accordingly finds a reason for describing extracts from Moses and the prophets as sayings of the Lord.'

The word *λόγια*, it must be remembered, always means inspired words or utterances, or revelations. The differences which arose were not as to its meaning, but as to its application or intendment. By the first generations of Christians the word was ordinarily applied, as it had been by the Greek Jews before them, to the Old Testament Scriptures; afterwards its application was extended to the sayings of Jesus, and finally, when the writers of the books in which those sayings were contained came to be considered as themselves inspired, to the books themselves and all they contained.

The oracles of the Lord, or revelations of the Lord, might, therefore, mean either the oracles or revelations delivered by the Lord, or the oracles or reve-

¹ With this passage from Irenaeus may be compared the various reading I have noticed in the above quotation from the Epistle of Polycarp.

lations delivered about the Lord; and in the latter case, either by way of prophecy as in the Old Testament or by way of an inspired narrative as in the New. Of these three possible meanings of the phrase I have already considered the one which I contend to be correct. I will now notice how the other two can be applied to the fragments of Papias, and I will take first that which obtained currency next in point of date, and which, therefore, stands next in point of probability—'The oracles or inspired sayings of the Lord.' It must be noticed that if this meaning be adopted, it follows equally with the theory I have been contending for, that the book ascribed to Matthew is not the first canonical gospel. No one would ever think of describing a book, the form of which is historical, 'The sayings of the Lord,' or by any similar title.

But however this may be, if we suppose these sayings to be sufficiently oracular to require interpretation, the meaning we are now considering gives a sufficiently intelligible meaning to the passage about Matthew, *per se*. When, however, it comes to be applied to the passage about Mark, the case is different. The fact that Peter did not speak as if he were making a syntax of the sayings of the Lord, does not give any intelligible reason why his interpreter, Mark, should write the things done by Christ, as opposed to what he said, without order or arrangement. In other words, if this meaning of *λογίων* be adopted, we get into the same difficulty of interpretation which besets the alternative reading *λόγων*. We see, therefore, that the interpretation of the context affords an independent reason for rejecting the meaning 'sayings of the Lord.'

The last of the three meanings of which the phrase is capable assumes the existence of a New Testament canon, the writers of which were supposed not merely to be the recorders of inspired sayings of Jesus, but to be themselves inspired. As there is no reason to suppose that any other books acquired this reputation before those of the present canon, the adoption of the meaning we are now considering involves the application of the fragments of Papias to our canonical Matthew and Mark. Now adopting this sense, *κυριακὰ λόγια* would mean the Scriptures of the Lord or the New Testament Scriptures, or might be confined to the gospels.

Now what can be meant by saying that Peter did not speak as if making a syntax of the New Testament or of the gospels? The supposition is that the New Testament, or at all events the second gospel, did not then exist, and that Peter's discourses were the materials out of which it was to be constructed. It is scarcely necessary to go further and consider why, if Papias had in view the canon as we now have it, he should deny to Mark, who he says distinctly and repeatedly was accurate as far as he went, that inspiration¹ which he accorded to Matthew, or even why he should deny that Mark's gospel formed a syntax of the New Testament or the gospels. If by a syntax he meant a synopsis, the canonical gospel of Mark does in fact present some features of a synopsis of Matthew and Luke, so that some critics have contended that that was its origin. If, on the other hand, he

¹ Perhaps I should say rather: Why should Papias deny this inspiration, &c., to Peter? But if he denied it to Peter, it seems to follow that he must have denied it to Mark.

meant a harmony, why, it may be asked, should Mark's work be expected to present this character? Why should the absence of this character be a reason for describing it as without order or arrangement? Finally, why should it be described as without order or arrangement at all?

The many learned writers who have interpreted the fragments of Papias as applicable to our present gospels, appear to have fallen into the following misconception. The writings of an historian believed to be inspired might be described as his *λόγια* or inspired utterances, but that does not make the word *λόγια* mean history, so that *τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου* could not, much less could *τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια*, mean the history of the Lord. What the words may mean is, the inspired utterances of Matthew or some one else about the Lord, but the reference to the historian whose *λόγια* they are, is always necessary. By adopting this mistranslation, and rendering *λόγια* history,¹ no doubt the fragments may in some sense be interpreted as applying to our present gospels, though even then the difficulty remains why Mark should be described as being without order. On the whole, the difficulties of applying any other meaning so as to give an intelligible interpretation of the context, support not a little the view that by *λόγια* Papias referred to passages in the Old Testament, and by *λόγια κυριακὰ* meant Messianic prophecies, which I have shown by citations from I think all the extant authorities to have been the usual application of the word among Christians or Greek Jews in his day.

In considering the question whether Papias used our present canonical gospels, there are several matters

¹ As for instance was done by Mr. Crusé.

which ought not to be overlooked. The first is the way in which Eusebius disparages him, which, it must be noticed, is not merely on account of his millenarian tendencies. He says he related one extraordinary thing after another, as having come to him from tradition (*παράδοξά τινα ἱστορεῖ καὶ ἄλλα ὡς ἂν ἐκ παραδόσεως εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλθόντα*); and again, that he reported as having come to him from unwritten tradition, certain strange parables of the Saviour, and teachings of his, and other things rather fabulous (*ξένας τέ τινας παραβολὰς τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τινα ἄλλα μυθικώτερα*); and again:—

‘In his own book he hands down other statements of Aristion before described of the words of the Lord and traditions of John the Elder, to which referring those eager to learn, we will, &c. (*ἐφ’ ὧς τοὺς φιλομαθεῖς ἀναπέμψαντες*).’

All this shows that the book of Papias contained statements about Jesus inconsistent with those contained in the canonical gospels, and which Eusebius was, therefore, unwilling to mention, and which, therefore, afford a certain amount of evidence that Papias did not use those books. Now the Church endorsed the verdict of Eusebius upon Papias in a way not a little remarkable, in allowing his books to be lost. Remarkable when one considers how little is known of Christianity in the first century, and how interesting, therefore, the statements of a writer must have been, who had conversed with persons who had seen and heard not merely the Apostles, but Jesus himself. That the writings of such a writer should be permitted to perish, can be explained only upon the assumption that they contained something inconsistent with the

fundamental assumptions upon which the teaching of the Church was based, so that though an individual here or there might be taken with them, no considerable number of Christians would care to read and therefore to multiply them. Now we see that Papias had peculiarities relating to the parables, teaching, and words of Jesus, which Eusebius describes as strange, and refrains from quoting, and which we must therefore suppose not merely to be not contained in the canonical gospels, but to be inconsistent with what is contained there. But though this was plain to Eusebius, Papias did not acquire in his own times the name of a heretic. On the contrary, Eusebius tells us that his authority was very high in the Church. It is, therefore, to be rather inferred that the standard by which the teaching of the Church was afterwards measured, that is to say the canonical gospels, did not exist in his day. The fact of these peculiarities of Papias does not rest simply on the statement of Eusebius. Particulars of sayings attributed to Jesus by Papias, of a character distinct from any contained in the canonical gospels, have been preserved by Irenaeus, and there has been preserved in other places an account of the death of Judas altogether different from that in Matthew; but these matters will be gone into afterwards.

I will now consider how the interpretation I have put on the word *λόγια*, or oracles, agrees with the other portions of the extracts from Papias contained in Eusebius. He says: ‘I will not hesitate to arrange in order for you with the interpretations, whatever things, &c.’

Why should he hesitate to confront these traditions

with his interpretations? Taking his interpretations to be interpretations of prophecy, the answer is obvious: lest they should be contradicted by the facts. But Papias says that he has such confidence in his interpretations, that he will not hesitate to put beside them the reported facts. Again, it follows from the interpretation I have put on the word *λόγια*, that the book he ascribes to Matthew is something different from our gospel, probably a mere set of extracts from the Hebrew Scriptures. It required to be interpreted, and could lend no aid to the interpreter beyond saving him the trouble of searching for the passages, and also incidentally from the risk of being disturbed in his work by the inconvenient suggestion of an inconsistent context. We can understand, therefore, how the oral traditions of what was said by Matthew assisted Papias more than the things out of his book.

But before going further, it will be well to consider what is the meaning of this extraordinary statement of Papias about things out of books; why did he, alone of all men, put more confidence in oral tradition than in written records? There can, I think, be no doubt that he was pressed in controversy by books, and that he had not books of equal weight to use in return. Therefore he rails against books generally. His remarks can scarcely be credited of a man accustomed to rely as Christians have since done upon the canonical gospels, and generally on the New Testament. But what were the books with which he was pressed? He has contrasted 'those who relate the commandments of another' with those who relate the commandments of the Lord himself. He then speaks of collecting traditions of the sayings of seven apostles, that is

with the natural omission of James, the son of Zebedee, and Judas Iscariot, of all the apostles except Bartholomew, as to whom the synoptic gospels are agreed, but of none of those about whom they differ. But there is one name left out, not a little remarkable in a man collecting traditions in Asia Minor, that is the apostle Paul; nor can this be rendered the less significant by pointing out that Paul had no personal intercourse with Jesus. It rather points to the conclusion that he is the person whose teaching is contrasted with that coming directly from the Lord, and that the books from which Papias did not derive assistance were his epistles, which must have formed the most important part of Christian literature at the time Papias wrote.

The passage in the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius, which we have been considering, contains the most considerable extracts from Papias and by far the most extensive notice of his work that are extant, and the only notice that bears directly upon the purpose we have in hand; but several notices of Papias by other writers have come down to us, containing among them three citations from his work. These notices I shall now proceed to consider; they are material to our present purpose so far as they afford evidence of the general character of his work, and therefore of the meaning of his title, and in particular of the word *λογίων* contained in it.

An extract from Apollinarius has been preserved in an ancient catena, which in turn contains a citation from Papias:—

'Judas did not die in the halter, but survived, having been taken down before he was strangled; and this the

Acts of the Apostles show, that falling headlong he burst asunder in the midst and his bowels gushed out; and this Papias, the disciple of John, relates more plainly, saying thus in the fourth book of the Exposition of the Dominical words (τῆς ἐξηγήσεως τῶν κυριακῶν λόγων). "But Judas walked about in this world, a great example of impiety, his flesh blown out so much that he was not able to pass even where a wagon passes easily, nay, not even the bulk only of his head. The lids of his eyes, they say, were swollen so much, that he did not see the light at all, that his eyes could not even be seen by a physician with an instrument, they were so much below the outward surface. Other organs were distorted to an unnatural size, and he suffered from foul discharges of matter and worms (τὸ δὲ αἰδοῦν αὐτοῦ πάσης μὲν ἀσχημοσύνης ἀηδέστερον καὶ μείζον φαίνεσθαι, φέρεσθαι δὲ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος συρρέοντας ἰχώρας τε καὶ σκώληκας εἰς ὕβριν δι' αὐτῶν μόνων τῶν ἀναγκαίων); but after many torments and retributions having died, they say, on his own estate, the estate became deserted and uninhabited until now from the smell, and not even until this day is anyone able to go by that place unless he stop his nostrils with his hands, so great a discharge was excreted upon the earth through his flesh." ¹

Another version of the same passage from Papias is given by Oecumenius, in his commentary on the Acts of the Apostles:—

'And this, Papias the disciple of John the Apostle, relates more plainly, Judas walked about in this world a great example of impiety, his flesh blown out so much that he was not able to pass though a wagon would pass easily by the wagon was he squeezed so that his entrails were poured out.' ²

¹ For Greek of this passage see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, abridged edit. p. 523.

² For Greek of this passage, which is perhaps corrupt, see Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, English translation, 1846, vol. iii. p. 236.

The agreement in language shows that this passage is ultimately derived from the same written source as the quotation in the catena, but several reasons go to show that the latter should be taken as the correct statement of Papias. It is taken from Apollinarius, probably one of the writers of that name of the fourth century; it cites the particular book of Papias from which it is taken, and it is more coherent with itself. The wagon remains a simile merely, while in Oecumenius the wagon introduced as a simile suspiciously develops into a fact. Moreover, the exceedingly disgusting and grotesque nature of the details as given in the catena affords a reason why an equally exemplary, but more presentable, account should be furnished.

The bearing the passage has on our present inquiry is this: it shows that Papias gave an account of the death of Judas inconsistent with the accounts given by Matthew and the Acts. Different as those accounts are from one another, they agree in this. The death of the traitor is made impressive by the rapidity with which it follows upon his treason. According to Matthew it took place even before the crucifixion of Jesus. According to the Acts, it was a matter which was already some time past on the day of the Ascension. Now, according to Papias, the fate of Judas is made impressive by its prolonged agony. Though no definite marks of time are given, a considerable interval is implied. This story, therefore, must have had its origin among people who were ignorant of either the account in Matthew or the account in the Acts, and its acceptance by Papias raises an inference that he was also ignorant of those accounts.

The accounts of the death of Judas both in Matthew

and the Acts, are represented as the fulfilment of prophecies. Strauss¹ is of opinion that other verses of the same Psalms cited in the Acts suggested the story preserved by Papias :—

‘He clothed himself with cursing as with his garment,

‘And it came into his inward parts like water,

‘And like oil into his bones.’²

‘Let their eyes be darkened that they see not, and make their loins shake continually.’³

It would appear, therefore, most probable that the story of the death of Judas was related by Papias as the fulfilment of Messianic prophecies.

Andreas, who was Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia about the end of the fifth century, wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, which contains two notices of Papias. In the first of these notices, speaking of the Apocalypse of John, he says :—

‘About, however, the inspiration (τοῦ θεοπνεύστου) of the book we believe it superfluous to speak at length, since the blessed men, Gregory I mean the theologian and Cyril, and besides, those who are more ancient, Papias, Irenaeus, Methodius, and Hippolytus, bear further witness to its trustworthiness (τὸ ἀξιόπιστον).’

The second notice is as follows :—

‘But thus Papias verbatim (ἐπὶ λέξεως). “But to some of them” (clearly the angels that were of old divine) “he gave also to rule the arrangement about the earth (τῆς περὶ τὴν γῆν διακοσμήσεως), and bade them rule well.” And next he says, “But it happened that their order (τὴν τάξιν) issued in nothing good, and the great Dragon was cast down—the old serpent,

¹ *Life of Jesus*, p. 237.

² Psalm cix. ver. 18.

³ Psalm lxix. ver. 23.

he that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world—he was cast down to the earth, and his angels.’¹

From these passages several things may be learned about Papias—that he was acquainted with the Apocalypse, and cited a passage from it now to be found verbatim in chapter xii. 9. This is also to be gathered that he thought it trustworthy (ἀξιόπιστος) and probably also inspired (θεόπνευστος), probably also the work of the apostle John. We further see that he held some doctrines having some resemblance to the cruder forms of gnosticism. There were certain angels of old divine to whom God gave the rule over the heavens which they ruled to so little purpose that they let the devil down on to the earth. Papias seems to look upon this transaction in a different light from that in which it is exhibited in the Apocalypse. There the action of Michael and his angels is represented as a success which occasioned great rejoicing in heaven. They were so glad there to be rid of the devil, that they did not care where he went to or who might suffer by his presence. Papias rather takes the view of a dweller upon earth, that it was the duty of the angels to keep the devil out.

The direct bearing of this passage upon the purpose we have in hand is small.

Anastasius of Sinai, a Greek monk, who lived towards the end of the seventh century, among other works wrote a book called ‘Anagogicæ Contemplationes in Hexaëmeron.’ The book, which consists of a mystical interpretation of the account of the

¹ For Greek, see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, abridged edit. p. 521.

creation in Genesis, makes mention of Papias in two places, the first of which is as follows:—

‘But since we have not found the end of those doubts which we have suggested, and we are wholly entangled in them, and are altogether at a loss, relying on the mouth of the holy spirit, the tongue, I mean, of Paul, which says that all things which are in the law were written beforehand for a type of Christ and his Church, having taken a start, if it behoves to speak truly, from Papias the Great of Hierapolis, who attended the teaching of the bosom disciple, and Clement, Pantaenus a priest of Alexandria, and the very learned Ammonius, the ancient and first interpreters, who agree with one another in having understood of Christ and his Church the whole of the six days (*πᾶσαν τὴν ἑξαήμερον*), after truly the sensible creation according to the letter, observing without any doubt a sense for the Church, on behalf of which is the whole aim of our contest, to this work we apply ourselves.’¹

The doubts mentioned are doubts concerning the interpretation of the narrative in Genesis of the creation in six days, the mystical interpretation of which forms the subject of the work of Anastasius.

The second passage is as follows:—

‘The more ancient of the expounders of the churches, I mean Philo, the philosopher and contemporary of the Apostles, and Papias the Great of Hierapolis, the disciple of John the Evangelist, and Irenaeus of Lyons, and Justin the Martyr and Philosopher, and Pantaenus of Alexandria, and Clement the Stromatist (*Στροματίτης*), and their followers, viewed the things about Paradise spiritually, transferring them to the Church of Christ, of whose number are also the two Gregories of Cappadocia, who are all wise about everything, all these men saying from the following causes

¹ See Appendix viii. For Greek of part see Lightfoot, *A. P.*, abridged ed. p. 521.

that there is also a spiritual paradise. First because if Adam was not subject to destruction when he was made, it is evident that he was not a partaker of earthly food on which destruction falls. For if he could be a partaker of earthly food it is also evident that destruction falls on him, for whatsoever goeth into the mouth is cast out into the draught; but if destruction fell on him he was altogether mortal; and if he was created mortal, death was not in any way made through disobedience. And this, indeed, is the first cause of the expositors, &c.’¹

After this Anastasius continues at a considerable length to propound other analogous reasons as if they were the conjoint opinions of the various authors he has mentioned. He afterwards cites a work of Justin on the Hexaëmeron, which is not now extant. As there is no means of ascertaining how far anything Anastasius says is taken accurately from Papias, it is not worth while to follow him further, but notwithstanding this doubt the passages cited are evidence that Papias wrote upon the interpretation of the Old Testament—i.e. upon the Messianic prophecies.

Another mention of Papias is the following. Certain extracts in a manuscript discovered by Cramer in the Bibliotheca Regia at Paris are introduced by the following words:—

‘From the exposition of John of Antioch, which he worked out about the chronology and creation of the world (*περὶ χρόνων καὶ κτίσεως κόσμου*), as he says, from the books of Moses, Africanus Eusebius, Papias (*Παππίου*) and Didymus, and others.’²

¹ See Appendix viii.

² Cramer, *Anecdota Græca e cod. manuscriptis bibliothecæ regiae Parisiensis*, vol. ii. p. 379. For Greek, see Appendix ix.

By John of Antioch is here meant John Malalas, and the extracts which follow may be presumed to come from the lost commencement of his chronicle. They begin, 'Adam had from God the measure of mankind—a stature of six feet, &c.' The fables which follow contain a curious mixture of incidents from the Old Testament and the mythology.

The connection would appear to show that Papias of Hierapolis is intended, though from the spelling the name might perhaps as well be Pappus, especially as Eusebius always gives the genitive of Πάπιας, Πάπια; Andreas of Caesarea, however, gives it Πανίου. Supposing then, as I think we ought, Papias to be meant, the notice raises an inference that his work contained an account of the creation of the world and therefore dealt with the Old Testament.

This confirms the inference to be drawn from Anastasius of Sinai.

Maximus the Confessor, who, after having been secretary to the Emperor Heraclius and abbot at Chrysopolis, suffered many tortures by order of the Emperor Constans II. by reason of his opposition to the monothelite heresy, among numerous works wrote scholia upon some of the writings attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite. Two of these scholia make mention of Papias. In the book on the Celestial Hierarchy Dionysius is made to address Timothy as child (παῖ), and upon this passage Maximus writes the following scholium:—

'It must be enquired how the great Dionysius calls the divine Timothy a child. Either, as I think, as being advanced beyond him in years he says this, and as excelling him in philosophy, as the writings in our hands show, for

even if the holy Timothy believed before the divine Dionysius, as the Acts of the Apostles show, yet at least as regards his outside training the great Dionysius was the stronger, or he calls him child as imitating the Lord saying, 'Children, have ye aught to eat?' or because they used to call those who practise guilelessness before God children, as Papias shows in the first book of his Dominical expositions (τῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεων), and Clement of Alexandria in his "Pedagogue."¹

The question then arises whether this passage throws any light upon the contents of the work of Papias. It will be noticed that Maximus distinguishes four grounds upon which Timothy might be addressed by Dionysius as child, first on account of the superiority of Dionysius in age; second, on account of the superiority of Dionysius in learning; thirdly, as imitating the Lord; and fourthly in accordance with a bygone practice which was explained by Papias and Clement. The point which we have to determine is whether the usage referred to was that of the writers of the Old or of the New Testament Scriptures, and upon this point the work of Clement, which is extant, may throw some light upon the work of Papias, which is not. When we turn to the 'Pedagogue' of Clement, we find that the passage referred to is probably chapter x. of book i. entitled 'That all who concern themselves about the truth are children before God' ('Ὅτι πάντες οἱ περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν καταγιγνομένοι παῖδες παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ).

In this chapter Clement undertakes to justify the title of his book 'Paedagogus, or the Instructor of Children,' by showing that Christians are properly described as children, and this he does by citing

¹ For the Greek, see Appendix x.

passages of both the Old and New Testaments, beginning with the passage from John xxi. cited by Maximus. So far, then, when Maximus refers to the usage of Clement, he might refer either to his interpretation of the New or of the Old Testament, but we see that Maximus opposes the usage of Clement and Papias to the imitation of the Lord, that is, he considers that one reason why Dionysius might address Timothy as child would be because he imitated the Lord, and another because he followed a practice that was shown by Clement and Papias. Now the passages cited by Clement from the New Testament are nearly all utterances of Jesus (John xiii. 33; xxi. 4, 5; Matthew x. 16; xi. 16, 17; xviii. 1, 3; xix. 14; xxi. 9, 16; xxiii. 37; xxv. 33). The usage of Clement therefore, as based on these passages, would scarcely be seen to be anything different from the imitation of the Lord. We are, therefore, drawn to the conclusion that Maximus refers to the principle of interpretation applied by Clement to the passages from the Old Testament according to which the word 'children,' or other words which might be taken as equivalent to it, had some hidden sense not apparent from the context. In such passages, for instance, as Psalm cxiii. 1, according to the LXX, 'Praise, oh children, the Lord;' or Isaiah viii. 18, 'Here am I and the children whom God hath given me;' or Leviticus xv. 29, xii. 8, where a mystic allusion is seen in the two young pigeons and the pair of turtle doves; or Isaiah lxxv. 15, 16, 'But my servants shall be called by a new name;' or the reference to the lambs in Isaiah xi. 11; or the humble and meek in Isaiah lxxv. 2, it is not obvious where Clement finds any reason for the proposition by

which he justifies his title. In other cases his interpretation is more decidedly mystical, as where conversely he interprets the words in Psalm v. 6, 'The Lord abhors the bloody man,' as applying to the Devil, who is there called man as perfect in wickedness, on the ground that 'man' in prophecy signifies perfection, or where he interprets the words of Genesis xlix. 11, 'and he bound his foal to the vine,' to mean 'having bound this simple and childlike people to the Logos, figuratively represented as a vine,' or when he says:—

'The child is, therefore, gentle (*ἤπιος οὖν ὁ νήπιος*), and on this account the rather tender, delicate, and simple, without deceit and hypocrisy, upright in mind and straightforward, which is the foundation of simplicity and truth. "For," he says, "to whom shall I have respect but to the humble and meek?"'

But perhaps the most striking instance of mystical interpretation is to be found in the use of the story of Abimelech seeing Isaac sporting with Rebecca, Genesis xxvi. 8. Of this passage Clement gives two interpretations. He begins:—

'I refer Isaac also to a child. Isaac is interpreted laughter. The inquisitive king saw him sporting with his wife and helpmeet Rebecca. The king, whose name was Abimelech, seems to me a supermundane wisdom looking down upon the mystery of training; but Rebecca they interpret patience, *Ῥεβέκκαν δὲ ἐρμηνεύουσιν ὑπομονήν*.'

According to the second interpretation, Rebecca, from meaning patience, passed on to mean the Church, which is called Patience because she remains to all generations, subsisting by the patience of believers, and both the King and Isaac mean Christ, the former,

apparently, as in heaven, and the latter as manifested on earth. In this interpretation neither the allegory nor its interpretation is otherwise than very obscure, and it will be noticed that both turn upon the meaning patience given to Rebecca. This is taken from Philo, as is the whole of the first interpretation, except so much of it as makes Isaac mean child as well as laughter (see Lib. II., 'De Plant. Noe,' 40, 41). But it will be noticed that Clement speaks in the plural—'they interpret'—from which it would appear that he follows some other authority as well as Philo. It is therefore not at all improbable that one of the interpretations is taken by him from Papias. This is the more probable as we have seen that Anastasius of Sinai couples the name of Papias with that of Philo. On the whole, the inference appears to be that Maximus refers to some mystic system adopted by Papias of interpreting the Old Testament, and therefore supports the view that his book was upon the interpretation of Old Testament Scriptures. Again, in Chapter VII. of the 'Ecclesiastical Hierarchy,' Dionysius, while dealing with the resurrection, is made to say as follows:—

'But others turning aside, I know not how, to material ideas have said that the most holy and blessed lot announced to the saints is of the same kind as the life here, and have unlawfully cast food which pertains to a changeable life to those equal to the angels. But no one of the most holy men will ever fall into such errors.'¹

Upon this passage Maximus writes the following comment:—

¹ For the Greek, see Appendix x.

'He says this, I think, hinting at Papias who had then become bishop of Hierapolis in Asia and who flourished together with John the divine Evangelist. For this Papias, in the fourth book of his Dominical Expositions, spoke of enjoyments in the resurrection through things eaten: in which opinion, which some call the Millennium, Apollinarius subsequently believed, as appears in his writing. How then are the writings of the holy Dionysius, as some foolishly say, which answer Apollinarius the work of Apollinarius? And Irenaeus of Lyons in his fifth book against heresies says the same, and adduces the aforesaid Papias as a witness of the things said by him.'¹

Photius also has a notice of Papias and Irenaeus to a similar effect, whom he describes as saying—

'That the enjoyment of eating certain sensible things is the Kingdom of the Heavens, αἰσθητῶν τινῶν βρωμάτων ἀπόλασιν εἶναι τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείαν.'²

The passage in Irenaeus referred to is the following:—

'These things are to take place in the times of the kingdom, that is on the seventh day, which was sanctified, on which God rested from all works which he did, which is the true Sabbath of the just, in which they shall not do any earthly work, but shall have beside them a table prepared by God, feeding them with all kinds of dishes. As the blessing of Isaac, with which he blessed his younger son Jacob, also imports, saying, "Behold the smell of my son as the smell of a fruitful field which God has blessed." Now the field is the world, and therefore he added, "God give thee of the dew of heaven and of the fatness of the earth, plenty of corn and wine, and let nations serve thee and princes bow down to thee, and be lord over thy brother, and thy father's sons shall bow down to thee. Whosoever

For the Greek, see Appendix x.

² See Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, abridged edit. p. 523.

shall curse thee shall be cursed, and whosoever shall bless thee shall be blessed." Whoever then will not receive these things as prophecies of the kingdom will fall into great contradiction and contrariety, in which the Jews, falling into utter perplexity, are placed. For not only in this life the nations did not serve this Jacob, but after the blessing he himself set out and served his uncle Laban the Syrian twenty years, and not only was he not made lord of his brother, but he himself bowed down to his brother Esau when he returned from Mesopotamia to his father, and offered him many gifts, and how did he inherit plenty of corn and wine who, on account of a famine in the land in which he dwelt, migrated into Egypt, being made subject to Pharaoh who then reigned in Egypt? So, the foretold blessing without doubt pertains to the times of the kingdom, when the just rising from the dead will reign, when also creation renewed and liberated will bring forth plenty of all sorts of food from the dew of heaven and from the fatness of the earth, as the elders who saw John the disciple of the Lord have related, that they heard from him how the Lord used to teach about those times and say, Days shall come in which vines shall grow, each having ten thousand stems, and on each stem ten thousand branches, and on each branch ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand bunches, and on each bunch ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed shall give twenty-five measures of wine, and when one of the saints shall lay hold of one of these bunches another will cry out, I am a better bunch; take me; through me bless the Lord. Likewise also that a grain of wheat shall bear ten thousand ears, and each ear shall have ten thousand grains, and each grain ten pounds of fine white wheaten flour, and that the rest of the fruits, seed, and herbs shall bring forth in similar proportions, and that all animals using those foods which are obtained from the earth shall become peaceable and agree with one another, being subject to men with all subjection. But these things Papias also,

a man of primitive times who had been the hearer of John and the companion of Polycarp, testifies in writing in the fourth of his books, for there are five books composed by him. And he added these words, These things are credible to those who believe, and he says that when Judas the traitor did not believe, and asked the question, How will such fruitful stocks be produced by the Lord? the Lord said, They shall see who shall come to those times. Prophesying then these times, Isaiah said, And the wolf shall feed together with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, &c.¹

One is under no grammatical compulsion to suppose that Irenaeus quoted the authority of Papias for anything more than the sayings of Jesus handed down by the elders, and so far we find Papias an authority for attributing to Jesus teachings of a different cast from any in the canonical gospels. The doctrines to which this teaching gave rise appear to have been held, not merely by Papias, Apollinarius, and Irenaeus, but, as Eusebius tells us, by very many of the ecclesiastical writers who came after Papias (*τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν πλείστοις . . . τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν*). Their prevalency, therefore, points to a time when the doctrines of the church were not governed by the canonical gospels, and is therefore favourable to Papias at all events, having written at a time when these gospels did not exist. But, apart from the mere grammatical import of the reference made by Irenaeus to Papias, the reference of Maximus leads us to the surmise that the teaching of Irenaeus upon the topic in question is founded upon the teaching of Papias. If that is so, the whole passage above quoted,

¹ Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 33, 1 Stieren, pp. 808-810,

from the quotation of the blessing of Isaac downwards, may be taken from Papias, and if that is so, we see an exact illustration of the use Papias said he would make of his traditions.

'But I will not hesitate to arrange in order for you, with the interpretations, whatever things at any time I well learned from the elders and well remembered.'

Papias began with the prophecy from the Old Testament. Of this he gave his interpretation, and he then added in confirmation the saying of Jesus he had learned from the elders. In this aspect the passage confirms the view that Papias was writing on the interpretation of Old Testament prophecies. The words 'for the field is the world,' which interrupt the statement of the prophecy, quoted perhaps from Matthew xiii. 38, may very well (on this supposition) be an addition of Irenaeus.

Proceeding further, there is a probability rather more remote, but still not inconsiderable, that the whole argument of Irenaeus upon the Millennium is based upon Papias, and it therefore becomes important to consider its nature in order to see whether it throws any light upon the nature of the books of Papias. Irenaeus begins the topic as follows:—

'Since the opinions of certain men are taken from the discourses of the heretics, and they are ignorant of the dispositions of God and the mystery of the resurrection of the just, and of the kingdom, which is the beginning of incorruption, by which kingdom those who shall be worthy become accustomed little by little to put on the God¹ (*capere Deum*), it is necessary to speak about these things, since, rising again at the appearance of God, the just ought first in this condition,

¹ I.e. to become sons of God or gods by adoption.

which is renewed to receive the promise of the inheritance which God promised to the fathers and to reign in it (*recipere promissionem hereditatis quam Deus promisit patribus*), and then the Judgment to take place afterwards. For in the same condition in which they laboured or were afflicted, being proved in all ways through suffering, it is just that they should receive the fruits of their suffering, in the same condition in which they were slain for the love of God that they should be made alive, and in the same condition in which they sustained slavery that they should reign. For God is rich in all things, and all things are his. It is right, then, that that very condition made whole again to its pristine state should without a prohibition be at the service of the just.'¹

Upon this passage two remarks are to be made. The first is that Irenaeus states that the opinions he is controverting, which he acknowledges were very prevalent in the Church, were derived from the discourses of the heretics, by whom he means the Gnostics. This is in agreement with the statement of Eusebius that very many of the ecclesiastical or Church writers who followed Papias agreed with him about the Millennium. We are therefore led to the conclusion that Irenaeus is correct in stating that he is maintaining the ancient opinion of the Church, and that the contrary opinion, which was growing in his time and which subsequently prevailed, was really owing to the Church having approximated its teaching to that of the Gnostics. The second remark is that Irenaeus contends that the 'just ought first . . . to receive the promise of the inheritance which God promised to the fathers.' He therefore expressly bases his case upon Old Testament prophecies, and

¹ Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 32, s. 1, 1 Stieren, p. 806.

this is borne out by the details of his arguments. The general substance of them is this: such and such promises were made to Abraham and his seed, to Isaac, Jacob, and the Jewish people. These promises have not been fulfilled as yet; therefore they have yet to be fulfilled to the Christian Church in the Millennium. By far the greater part of the bulk of the portion of Irenaeus dealing with this topic—that is, of the last four chapters of his fifth book—is taken up by citations from the Old Testament, including one from an Apocryphal book, and the Revelation and the interpretation of those citations. Besides this, however, Irenaeus makes citations from or allusions to the gospels, Acts, and epistles which are not merely less numerous, but not nearly so bulky. In all he makes sixty-seven citations or allusions—i.e. thirty-three from the Old Testament, seven from the Revelation, thirteen from the Acts and epistles, and fourteen at the utmost from the gospels, of which twelve are to discourses of Jesus, and two to words spoken by John the Baptist, which are mentioned twice. Of the twelve citations from discourses of Jesus three occur in a passage quoted from the elders, to which it will be necessary to give separate consideration, and of the remaining nine five are short sayings cited to explain something else, not themselves the subject of any exposition. ‘Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.’ ‘Now the field is the world,’ a statement that the Lord styled Gehenna ‘eternal fire.’ ‘Heaven and earth shall pass away,’ a mention of the first resurrection of the just. I mention the last as it is sometimes marked as an allusion to Luke xiv. 14, but it is more likely

an allusion to Revelation xx. 4. There is nothing in Luke to distinguish between a first and a second resurrection. The context in the Revelation shows that the first resurrection is a resurrection of the just. Of the remaining four citations from the gospels one is a passage of some length, apparently cited from Luke xii. 37, 38.

‘Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching. Verily I say unto you that he shall gird himself, and make them sit down to meat, and shall come and serve them. And if he shall come in the evening watch and find them so, blessed are they since he shall make them sit down and shall serve them. And although he should come in the second or third watch, happy are they.’¹

This quotation is wedged in between a quotation from Isaiah lviii. 14 and a quotation from the Apocalypse xx. 6, and has no separate exposition.

The remaining three quotations are as follows; they immediately precede the passage above cited, in which Papias is mentioned by name.

‘But, on account of this, coming to the passion (*ad passionem veniens*) that he might announce to Abraham and those who were with him the good news of the unfolding of the inheritance, when he had given thanks, holding the cup, and had drunk of it and given to his disciples, he said to them, Drink ye all of it. This is my blood of the New Testament which will be shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of this vine until that day when I shall drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom. Undoubtedly he will himself renew the inheritance of the earth,

¹ Stieren, Irenaeus, p. 812.

and restore the mystery of the glory of his sons, as David says, "Who has renewed the face of the earth." He promised to drink of the fruit of the vine with his disciples, showing both things, that is to say the inheritance of the earth in which the new fruit of the vine is drunk and the resurrection of his disciples in the flesh. For the flesh which rises again new is the same which also receives the new cup. For neither placed on high in a place above the heavens with his disciples can he be understood as drinking the fruit of the vine, nor again are they without flesh who drink it, for the drink which comes from the vine belongs to the flesh and not to the spirit. And on this account the Lord said, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, do not call rich men or thy friends, neighbours, and kinsmen, lest they call thee in return, and a recompense be made by them; but call the lame, the blind, and the beggars, and thou shalt be blessed because they have not wherewith to recompense thee, for thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just. And again he says, Whosoever shall have left lands or houses or parents or brethren or sons because of me shall receive in this world an hundred fold, and in that to come shall inherit eternal life. For what are the dinners given to the poor and suppers which are in this world returned a hundred fold? These things are to take place in the times of the kingdom,' &c. (as in the previous quotation).¹

In these cases, therefore, we get expositions of discourses of Jesus, but the rest of what Irenaeus has written does not in any wise assume the form of an exposition of these passages. He does not begin with them. He has previously dealt with the promises to Abraham, and in commencing the topic he expressly puts it upon the fulfilment of the promises which God promised to the fathers. It would take up too much

¹ Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 33, 1 Stieren, p. 808.

space to deal with the prophecies from the Old Testament and Revelation as I have done with the citations from the gospels. The bulk of them may be judged from the fact that the portion of the works of Irenaeus under consideration takes up in Stieren's edition sixteen pages of printed matter. Supposing now that Irenaeus in this portion of his work copied Papias verbatim, it may be asked, Would the work properly be described as 'An exposition of the discourses of the Lord'? It must be answered No, it would be much better described as an exposition of the Messianic prophecies. But even if Irenaeus copied Papias at all we have no reason to suppose that he copied Papias verbatim, and that being so, we may ask which portion of the work of Papias is he most likely to have enlarged—the references to the Old Testament, or the references to the New Testament? It must be answered that, having regard to the ages of the writers, Irenaeus would be nearly certain to increase the New Testament element; *a fortiori*, therefore, we conclude, that if this part of Irenaeus is based on Papias, the work of Papias was an exposition of Messianic prophecies, and not of the discourses of Jesus. It is impossible to draw any conclusion whether any of the passages from the gospels or from other canonical books of the New Testament, except the Revelation, were taken from Papias; all such passages, and all allusions to such passages, might be omitted from this part of the works of Irenaeus without materially affecting his arguments. If any of the New Testament quotations, other than those from the Revelation, come from Papias, the three passages appearing to be quotations from the canonical gospels which I have cited last,

and which alone have separate interpretations, are most likely to have been used by Papias, and especially the first of the three, as to drinking of the cup at the last supper. Papias must have been acquainted with this incident in some form or other, either from tradition or the usage of the Christians at their love feasts, or from the book which he mentions as written by Mark. The same book probably contained other matter which was adopted by the writers of the canonical gospels; things recorded by Papias from tradition may also have found their way into the canonical gospels. Many writers are of opinion that the story of the woman taken in adultery, in the fourth gospel, comes from Papias, and it has been printed as one of the extant fragments of his works in a posthumous work bearing the name of the late Dr. Lightfoot. This, I think, was an error, for there does not appear any evidence that this particular story is taken from Papias, but the process is a perfectly possible one, and in all probability some portions of the canonical gospels are based upon the traditions he collected, though we have no means of pointing to any particular passage as having been so based. Still, though there is no improbability in these passages being mentioned by Papias, we have no ground to infer that he did mention them, for they are passages that Irenaeus might not improbably add himself, and it must be noticed that the quotation as to the taking the cup has no such connection with the preceding words as the 'propter hoc,' with which the sentence is introduced, would lead one to suppose. It does not appear intelligible that Jesus took the cup and spoke to his disciples in order to preach the gospel to Abraham and

those that were with him. The omission of the quotation as to the cup would, therefore, rather improve the sense of the passage; the opening words of which would then be 'on account of this enduring the passion that he might preach to Abraham and those who were with him the good news of the opening of the inheritance.' This is good sense. It might be contended that unless Jesus suffered death, he could not go to the place of departed spirits to preach to Abraham, and the words, 'undoubtedly he will himself renew the inheritance of the earth and restore the mystery of the glory of his sons, as David says, who has renewed the face of the earth,' will follow without greater abruptness than in their present context. After this, omitting all the intervening words, the context would run quite naturally. 'These things are to take place in the times of the kingdom, &c.,' that is to say, it is in the times of the kingdom that the face of the earth is to be renewed. We see, therefore, it is not at all improbable that these quotations from the gospels have been interpolated into a text which did not originally contain them. Supposing, therefore, Irenaeus based this part of his work upon Papias, these quotations from the gospels and their interpretations are probably additions of his own.

I will now pass on to consider the passage I omitted in which Irenaeus quotes from the elders. It is as follows:

'For when this form passes away, and man is renewed and flourishes to incorruption, so that he cannot any longer grow old, the heaven will be new and the earth new. In these new places man will remain always new and holding intercourse with God. And since these things

shall always remain without end Isaiah says, "For as the new heaven and the new earth which I make remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name continue." And, as the elders say, then also those who have been thought worthy of the spending of their time in heaven (τῆς ἐν οὐρανῷ διατριβῆς) shall go there, others shall enjoy the delight of paradise (τῆς τοῦ παραδείσου τρυφῆς), and others shall possess the brightness of the city (τὴν λαμπρότητα τῆς πόλεως); for everywhere the Saviour [or, according to the reading of the old Latin version, God] shall be seen, as they shall be worthy who see him. And that this is the difference of the habitation of those who bring forth a hundredfold and those who bring forth sixtyfold and those who bring forth thirtyfold (τῶν τὰ ἑκατὸν καρποφορούντων καὶ τῶν τὰ ἑξήκοντα καὶ τῶν τὰ τριάκοντα): of whom the first will be taken up into the heavens, the second will pass their time in paradise, and the third will dwell in the city, and that on this account the Lord said, "In the realms of my Father (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου) are many stations (μοναί, translated mansions, John xiv. 2)." For all things belong to God, who affords a fit habitation to everyone; as his Word says (*quemadmodum verbum ejus ait*), that it has been distributed by the Father to all men, according as each is worthy or will be. And this is the banqueting couch on which those shall recline who are called to the marriage and feasted. The elders, the disciples of the Apostles (*presbyteri apostolorum discipuli*), say that this is the arrangement and disposition of those who are saved, and that they progress through steps of this sort, and that through the Spirit indeed they ascend to the Son, and through the Son to the Father, the Son in turn yielding his work to the Father, as it has been said also by the Apostle (*quemadmodum et ab apostolo dictum est*), "For he must reign until he putteth all his enemies under his feet." The last enemy that shall be abolished is death. For in the times of the kingdom the just man existing on the earth shall already forget to die.¹

¹ Irenaeus, lib. v. cap. 36, 1 Stieren, p. 817.

The words here quoted from the elders stand for the purpose we have in hand in a different position from the context in which they occur. That context purports to be the work of Irenaeus, but it is plausibly conjectured that it is based upon Papias, and may, therefore, throw some light upon the nature of his work. The words in question may, as has been argued, be a quotation from Papias; in that case, so far as they go, they afford direct evidence of the nature of his work, of which they form a portion; on the other hand, they may not be a quotation from Papias, and in that case, as they have come from a different source, will throw no light, or but very faint light indeed, upon the nature of his work. The argument in favour of the quotation coming from Papias consists in this: Irenaeus expressly cites Papias as his authority for the last previous quotation he makes from the elders, whom he describes as the elders who had seen John the Disciple of the Lord (*presbyteri qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt*). In the present instance he describes them first, simply as 'the elders' (*οἱ πρεσβύτεροι*), and in the second place, as the elders, the disciples of the Apostles, 'presbyteri, apostolorum discipuli.' This distinction is, of course, by no means conclusive of a separate source, as Papias might record one tradition on the authority of the elders who had seen John and another on the authority of the elders the disciples of the apostles, though we have no knowledge that he did so, and one would rather expect from what he promises, that he would cite the particular apostle upon whose authority the tradition rested.

In this passage it must be noticed, the elders are not describing the millennium which was to take place

before the judgment, but the state of those who are saved after the judgment. This has some little bearing upon the question whether the passage came from Papias, in that we know from Eusebius that Irenaeus held views similar to those of Papias concerning the millennium, but we have no evidence what may have been the views of Papias as to what took place after the judgment. The probability, therefore, of the passage coming from Papias is rendered a little more remote.

We will next consider whether we can trace in Irenaeus any other probable source from which he could have derived knowledge, or supposed he could have derived knowledge, of what was said by elders who were disciples of the apostles, except from Papias. In his third book he makes the following remarks:—

‘ And Polycarp also, not only having been made a disciple by Apostles, and having lived among many who had seen the Christ, but also having been appointed by Apostles bishop in Asia in the church in Smyrna, whom we also have seen in our early youth (for he survived for a long time, and being very aged, gloriously and most conspicuously having suffered martyrdom, he departed this life), always taught these things which he learned from the Apostles, which also the church hands down, and which only are true. All the churches which are in Asia bear witness to them, and those who till now have succeeded Polycarp, who is a witness of the truth much more worthy of credit and reliable than Valentinus and Marcion and the rest of those who are wanting in judgment. Who also having come to Rome in the time of Anicetus, turned many of the heretics before mentioned to the church of God, having proclaimed that he had received from the Apostles as the one and only truth, that which has been handed down by the church. And there are some who heard from him (καὶ εἰσὶν

οἱ ἀκηκόουτες αὐτοῦ) that John the disciple of the Lord having gone to bathe at Ephesus, and seeing Cerinthus within, sprang out of the bathing house without having bathed, but exclaiming, Let us flee lest the bathing house should fall since Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is in it. And Polycarp himself once answered Marcion when he came into his sight, and said, Do you recognise me? I recognise the firstborn of Satan. So great caution the Apostles and their disciples (οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν) had in not holding communication even so far as a word with one of those who falsify the truth, as Paul also said, “A man that is heretical after a first and second admonition, refuse, knowing that such a one is perverted and sinneth, being self-condemned.”’¹

We see from this passage that Irenaeus had, or thought he had, means of knowledge of what was said and done by the disciples of the apostles, by reason of statements made to him by persons who had heard Polycarp when he visited Rome in the time of Anicetus, who had been bishop of Rome before Soter (the predecessor of Eleutherus), who was, as Irenaeus tells us, the bishop of Rome¹ at the time he was writing. According to Eusebius, Anicetus was bishop for eleven years, Soter for eight, and Eleutherus for either thirteen or fifteen. The visit of Polycarp to Rome would therefore be not less than eight years, and not more than thirty-four years, before Irenaeus was writing. This possible source of traditions, supposed to be derived from disciples of the apostles, goes a long way to weaken any inference that the passage we are considering is derived from Papias; but the matter can be pursued further. Irenaeus makes mention of elders who were the disciples of the

¹ Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* lib. iii. cap. 3, s. 4, 1 Stieren, p. 433.

apostles in an earlier part of his fifth book (chapter v.) which is as follows:—

‘Where, then, was the first man placed? Obviously in paradise, as it is written, And God planted a garden (*paradisum*) eastward in Eden, and there he put the man whom he had formed. And thence he was cast out into this world, having been disobedient. Wherefore the elders, the disciples of the Apostles (*οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, τῶν ἀποστόλων μαθηταί, presbyteri qui sunt apostolorum discipuli*), also say that those who were translated were translated there. For paradise was prepared (*ἡτοιμάσθη ὁ παράδεισος, paratus est paradisus*) for just men and those who have the spirit; into which also Paul the Apostle was carried and heard words unspeakable (*εἰσκομισθεῖς ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα*) as regards us at present; and that those who have been translated remain there until the consummation as a prelude to incorruption.’¹

As paradise is the subject of both quotations, there can be little doubt that the elders, the disciples of the apostles, are the same in both cases. It will also be noticed that in both cases a quotation is made from Paul which may be an addition made by Irenaeus, or may, which is perhaps more probable, come from the authority from whom he quotes. If that is so, one object of that authority would seem to be to show that the elders he quotes from agree with Paul.

The last previous mention of elders as the sources of information made by Irenaeus is in chapter xxvii. of his fourth book, and is in this wise: Irenaeus is endeavouring to controvert the contention of the Gnostics that the God of the Old Testament was not the same God as the God of the Christians; and in so

¹ *Adv. Haer.* lib. v. cap 5, s. 1, 1 Stieren, pp. 727, 728.

doing he backs up his argument by the authority of an elder, whom he does not name.

‘As I have heard from a certain elder who had heard from those who had seen the Apostles and from those who had learned (*Quemadmodum audivi a quodam presbytero qui audierat ab his qui apostolos viderant et ab his qui didicerant*).’¹

What Irenaeus means by those who had learned may not be quite certain. I understand the term to mean from those who had learned what the apostles taught, not necessarily from the apostles themselves, but from others who might know. There is a probability, therefore, that these persons are the persons whom he afterwards describes as the elders, the disciples of the apostles, and that the source of his knowledge as to what was said by the last-named elders was the unnamed elder who had heard those also who had seen the apostles. Irenaeus makes various statements on the authority of this elder:—

‘That that reproach which would be from the Scriptures was enough for those of old time for what they did without the counsel of the Spirit.’¹

After this, after some other examples, Irenaeus quotes from 1 Kings xi. 1, as to Solomon and his wives, according to the LXX, winding up

‘And the Lord was angry against Solomon, for his heart was not perfect towards the Lord as was the heart of David his father,’² and proceeds,

‘The Scripture sufficiently rebuked him, as said the elder, that no flesh may boast in the sight of God; and that on account of this the Lord descended to those places

¹ 1 Stieren, p. 648.

² *Ibid.*, p. 650.

which are under the earth, preaching for them also the good tidings of his coming, there being remission of sins to those who believe in him. Now all those who were hoping for him believed in him, that is all those who announced beforehand his coming and were subject to his directions, the just men, both prophets and patriarchs, to whom like as to us he remitted their sins, which we ought not to impute to them if we would not despise the grace of God.¹

We see here the elder deals with a topic akin to those dealt with by the disciples of the apostles in the two previous extracts; the state of the prophets or patriarchs who died before the coming of Christ naturally leading up to the state of those who were translated, as the state of those who were translated leads up to the consideration of the resurrection of the just. After more to the like effect, Irenaeus proceeds:—

‘We ought not, therefore, saith that older man (senior), to be proud nor to blame the ancients, but ourselves to fear lest by chance after the knowledge of Christ doing something which does not please God, we may not have further remission of our sins, but may be excluded from his kingdom. And that Paul therefore said. “For if he spared not the natural branches perchance neither may he spare thee, who when thou wast a wild olive wast grafted into the fatness of the olive and wast made a partaker of its fatness.” Similarly also you see that the misdoings of the people were described, not on account of those who then transgressed, but for our rebuke, and that we might know that the God against whom they offended and against whom certain of those who are said to have believed now offend, is one and the same. And that the Apostle showed this very plainly in his epistle which is addressed to the

¹ 1 Stieren, p. 650.

Corinthians, saying, “For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant how that our fathers were all under the cloud,” &c. (quoting 1 Corinthians x. 1-13).¹

Irenaeus then proceeds further to enforce his position in words not necessarily those of the elder, making two quotations from the gospels, and seven from Paul, and one from the Psalms when in the twenty-eighth chapter he makes the following remark:—

‘Truly the elders (*presbyteri*) showed those to be senseless who from those things which happened to them who formerly obeyed God try to introduce another Father.’²

We see here that Irenaeus, from speaking of the unnamed elder, suddenly jumps to the elders. It may be presumed that these elders are those who had learned, who are referred to as the sources of the information communicated to Irenaeus by the unnamed elder. We see also that the unnamed elder had a habit of winding up his statements with an appeal to the authority of the apostle Paul. This appears, certainly, from the passages which Irenaeus expressly quotes from the unnamed elder, and is suggested by the abundance of quotations from Paul occurring in places which, though not expressly quoted from the unnamed elder, are not improbably derived from him. Again, in the thirtieth chapter Irenaeus cites an elder (*presbyter*) in justification of the spoiling of the Egyptians, and in support of the position that we ought not to upbraid the patriarchs and prophets about those things which the Scriptures themselves lay to their charge. The similarity of the

¹ 1 Stieren, pp. 651, 652.

² *Ibid.* p. 654.

topic shows that the same unnamed elder is meant. Again, in the beginning of the thirty-second chapter Irenaeus remarks:—

‘Thus also an older disciple of the Apostles used to contend about the two testaments (*hujusmodi quoque de duobus testamentis senior apostolorum discipulus disputabat*), showing that both were by one and the same God,’ &c.¹

Here we see Irenaeus, instead of describing the elder as one who had heard from those who had seen the apostles, describes him as a disciple of the apostles; but the identity of the topic raises the inference that the same man is meant, and we ought not to correct the former and more precise description by the latter and vaguer. The former description rather shows in what sense the latter is to be taken—that is, that by disciple of the apostles Irenaeus merely meant a man who held the apostolic doctrine, which he had derived from others who had themselves derived it, but not immediately, from the apostles. The next reference we get to elders is to the elders the disciples of the apostles, mentioned in the fifth chapter of the fifth book. There cannot be any reasonable doubt that they are the same elders as were previously mentioned in the twenty-eighth chapter of the fourth book, and that they are the authorities upon whom the unnamed elder makes his statements: that is to say, they are men who had learned the apostolic doctrine, not from the apostles directly, but from other persons, who were, as Irenaeus supposed, able to teach it. We see Irenaeus makes the same change in referring to these elders as he does in referring to the unnamed elder.

¹ 1 Stieren, p. 664.

The unnamed elder is first presbyter, or senior, and afterwards becomes senior apostolorum discipulus. The elders, his authorities, are first presbyteri, afterwards presbyteri apostolorum discipuli.

The question now to determine is, who is the unnamed elder? He is, to begin with, some one with whom Irenaeus has come into personal contact; and Irenaeus professes to quote his oral teaching, not his books. Several persons have been suggested, such as Papias, Polycarp, Pothinus. It may be taken as certain that neither Papias nor Polycarp can be meant, for Irenaeus would not describe either of them as having heard those who had seen the apostles, and omit to mention what he believed of both of them, that they had actually heard the apostle John. This objection would not apply to Pothinus; but the fact that the elder is unnamed is a strong argument that he was not Pothinus. Irenaeus would have every motive to mention his predecessor in the see of Lyons, a bishop and a martyr, and this is a further reason why neither Polycarp nor Papias can be intended. The manner in which Irenaeus repeatedly refers to this elder without mentioning his name suggests that he must have had some reason for his reticence, which was probably that the elder in question was not a *persona grata* to the Church of Rome, and, having regard to the position taken up by Irenaeus, that may well have been. He was himself prepared to yield to the teaching of the Church of Rome and abandon the practices of his youth, as was shown in the matter of the celebration of Easter; but he was not prepared to excommunicate his old associates. He may therefore very well have been prepared to cite as an authority

some one whose peculiar views on some points may not have been at all acceptable at Rome. The opinion that the unnamed elder was not Papias is strengthened by the fact that he appears to be a man having a great reverence for Paul—in fact, he appears to cast his teaching into such a form as to show that the doctrines of the elders upon which it was based were the same as those of the apostle. Now we have shown that there is reason to suppose that Papias had an aversion to Paul, that Paul was the other man to whose teaching (*τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολάς*) Papias preferred that of the Lord, to whose books he preferred the oral traditions of the elders.

We may therefore conclude that the citations made by Irenaeus from the elders, the disciples of the apostles, do not come from Papias, and that, therefore, they have no bearing upon the present discussion. It is very probable that the unnamed elder is the authority from whom Irenaeus derived his information as to the visit of Polycarp to Rome. If so, we see another instance of his habit of teaching in the citation which shows that the conduct of John towards Cerinthus and of Polycarp towards Marcion was in accordance with the teaching of the apostle.

Papias is mentioned three times by Jerome. But Jerome appears to have derived all his information from the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius, for he mentions nothing that is not to be found there and repeats a portion of the commentary of Eusebius. In one place Jerome denies a report that he had translated the books of Josephus and of the saints Papias and Polycarp, saying that he had neither leisure nor strength to express such great works in another

tongue with the same elegance (*eadem venustate*), from which perhaps the inference ought to be drawn, that Papias had the reputation of writing in good Greek.

Another notice of Papias is the passage which has been interpolated in chapter xxxvi. of book 3 of the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius: 'A man in all things in the highest degree very learned, and knowing the Scripture' (*ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων*). Though not the words of Eusebius, these words proceed from some one who must have admired Papias and therefore it may be presumed have been acquainted with his writings. As the New Testament and especially the gospels are better known than the Old Testament, an acquaintance with the latter would be the more likely to furnish the occasion for the commendation.

I have now gone through the whole of the extant notices of Papias by writers who were acquainted with his works or, at all events, had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with them. In those notices we find evidence that Papias commented upon the Old Testament, but we do not find evidence that he used any books of the New Testament except the Apocalypse, the first epistle of John, and the first epistle of Peter. If the object of his work was to expound either the gospels or the discourses of Jesus, this is a very curious result, for in that event his work must have contained comments upon nearly every passage in the gospels, and it is strange that no one of those comments should have been preserved. It would not do from the scanty remains of Papias to draw the inference that he did not cite and comment upon some

passages parallel to those contained in the canonical gospels. As I have already noticed, it is highly probable that some such passages were to be found in his book, but on the other hand the nature of the extant notices makes it highly improbable that the bulk of his work was made up of comments upon such passages, that out of (say) twenty specimens taken at random no one should be a fair sample of the bulk.

The examination of the notices of Papias therefore supports the conclusion that his work consisted of comments upon the Old Testament and perhaps also of some on the Apocalypse which he may have regarded as equivalent to one of the prophets. That is to say, the investigation into the extant notices of the work leads to the same conclusion as the investigation into the usage of the name by which it is called. That is to say that by the word *λόγια*, or oracles, Papias meant the Old Testament or some part of it, and that when Papias says that Matthew wrote or compiled the oracles he means that he wrote a catena of Old Testament prophecies.

CHAPTER VII

BLEEK'S ANALYSIS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPELS

I WILL now pass on to consider whether any other traces can be found of a book such as I have inferred Papias attributed to Matthew, that is to say, a collection of Messianic prophecies in Hebrew, with or without their interpretation as applied to the life of Jesus.

There has been great controversy, as is well known, upon the question whether the canonical gospel of Matthew was originally written in Greek, or in Hebrew or Aramaic. And with a view of determining this question, the quotations of the Old Testament contained in it have been subjected to a rigorous scrutiny to try and ascertain whether they were taken from the Septuagint version, or are independent translations from the Hebrew. Of course if it could be shown that the quotations were independent translations from the Hebrew, it would be evidence so far that the book was originally written in Hebrew, or at all events in some language other than Greek. If, however, the quotations came from the Septuagint, that would tend to show a Greek original.

Now, examining the quotations with this object, the

German critic Bleek arrived at the following conclusions, which I will cite in the words of Dr. Davidson, through whom I am acquainted with them :¹—

‘According to him (Bleek) the citations in the Gospel are of two kinds, namely, those in which the Evangelist gives pragmatic indications respecting the fulfilment of expressions in the Old Testament, and those where the passages are quoted or used in the course of the narrative, as they occur in the discourses of persons who are introduced speaking. The latter are adduced according to the LXX, sometimes verbally even in cases where the LXX depart from the Hebrew, and sometimes with more freedom, but not in such a way as to lead to the supposition of the deviation being due to consultation of the Hebrew text. The former are adduced according to the writer’s own translation from the Hebrew, departing not merely from the words, but also the sense of the LXX, whose expressions are seldom seen through the places.’²

Davidson then makes the following remark :—

‘The fact that the Messianic passages are everywhere cited after the Hebrew is obviously favourable to the hypothesis of an Aramaic original,’ and he then proceeds to combat the argument in favour of a Greek original, which is deduced from the much larger number of quotations which follow the Septuagint.

At a subsequent place he sets out a list of sixty-one quotations, or rather quotations from and allusions to the Old Testament.³ Of these, eleven are marked as Old Testament statements, stated to be fulfilled, cited from the Hebrew. Thirty-two are marked as belonging to the second class, in which the LXX are

¹ In his introduction to the study of the New Testament, Bleek merely refers to the matter shortly. See the translation in Clark’s *Foreign Theological Library*, vol. i. p. 295.

² *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 378. ³ *Ibid.* p. 420.

followed, and twenty are not marked at all. It will be noticed that two quotations are marked both ways, and when looked at they are found to be mere allusions too vague to be of any account. Of the twenty not classed, some I think might be fairly set down as quotations from the LXX. The rest are allusions rather than quotations, but usually give sufficient indications of the LXX as their source.

Davidson, after some remarks, sums up the question in the following terms :—

‘But, notwithstanding the exceptions taken to the classification by Ebrard and Delitzsch, it is substantially a sound one. In the first class seven agree more or less closely with the Hebrew, and only two with the LXX ; in the second class there are three gradual exceptions to the derivation from the LXX.’¹

Davidson has only before mentioned one quotation of the first class as agreeing with the LXX, that in Matthew i. 23 :—

‘Behold, the virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us (Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεύμενον Μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός).’

This quotation agrees with the LXX according to the Alexandrine and Sinaitic Codices, with the exception that it has καλέσουσιν, in the third person plural active, instead of with the Alexandrine, καλέσεις, in the second person singular active, or with the Sinaitic καλέσει, in the second person singular middle or third person singular active, and that it adds the words μεθερ-

¹ *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 422.

μηνευόμενον Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός, 'which is, being interpreted, God with us.' If it be compared with the common or Vatican text which agrees with the Alexandrine in the reading καλέσεις, there is the further difference that the word ἔξει is used instead of λήψεται,¹ in the phrase 'be with child' (literally, 'have in her womb'), instead of 'take in her womb.' The first impression produced is undoubtedly that Davidson is right and that the quotation came from the LXX. I shall, however, be able subsequently to adduce reasons which will make it probable that the quotation is taken from an independent translation, and that the resemblance to the LXX is produced by assimilation, whether by the original author of the gospel or a subsequent hand.

Passing on to the quotations of the second class which agree with the Hebrew—one of them, Matthew ii. 6, 'And thou Bethlehem,' &c., is a Messianic prophecy put into the mouths of the chief priests and scribes, and ought rather to fall into the first class, not occurring in the discourses of Jesus or his interlocutors. Another, 'Behold I send my messenger before thy face who shall prepare thy way before thee,' put into the mouth of Jesus, Matthew xi. 10, occurs verbatim as part of the narrative in Mark i. 2. We have only to assume, with many critics, that Mark here represents the more ancient form of the text, and the quotation will fall into the first class. The remaining allusion, for it can scarcely be called a quotation, that in Matthew xxii. 24, 'Moses said, if a man die

¹ The reading of the Vatican codex, according to the edition published under the auspices of Pius IX, Pontifex Maximus, Romae, 1872, is λήψεται; according to Tischendorf, Lipsiae, 1850, it is λήψεται.

having no children, his brother shall marry his wife and raise up seed unto his brother,' I must leave to Hebrew scholars. A comparison of the Greek and the English version of Deuteronomy does not disclose any reason why it should not come from the LXX as well as anywhere else.

In considering Bleek's classification of the quotations and Davidson's comments on it, it must be remembered that Bleek's contention is that the gospel comes from a Greek original and Davidson's that it comes from an Aramaic original, and that the classification of the quotations, in which they both substantially agree, supports neither theory effectively, but Bleek's better than Davidson's, by far the larger portion of the quotations coming from the LXX. It is therefore not surprising that the theory should hold rather better than Davidson allows it to do.¹

¹ This distinction between the quotations is recognised by Dr. Westcott, the present Bishop of Durham. He says, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 7th edit. p. 229 note a, speaking of the Old Testament quotations in Matthew: 'These may be divided into two distinct classes; the first consisting of such passages as are quoted by the Evangelist himself, as fulfilled in the life of Christ; the second of such as are interwoven into the discourses of the different characters, and form an integral part of the narrative itself. . . . The first class is made up of original renderings of the Hebrew text, while the second is in the main in close accordance with the LXX, even where it deviates from the Hebrew.' Dr. Salmon is also to the same effect. Speaking of the Old Testament quotations in the gospels, he says: 'Several such quotations are peculiar to St. Matthew, and are introduced by him with the formula "that it might be fulfilled." In these cases the ordinary rule is that the Evangelist does not take the quotation from the LXX, but translates directly from the Hebrew. It is otherwise in the case of quotations which Matthew has in common with the other Evangelists. As a rule they are taken from the LXX, and when they differ from our text of the LXX, all agree in the deviation.' See *Introduction to the New Testament*, 4th edit. p. 145.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS PARTLY FROM GREEK AND PARTLY
FROM ARAMAIC SOURCES

THE theory, *primâ facie* supported by the analysis of the quotations, is that the canonical gospel of Matthew comes from two different sources, one a work on the interpretation of the Messianic prophecies originally written in Hebrew, another containing the discourses of Jesus originally written in Greek.

If this theory can be sustained, it evidently supports and is supported by the interpretation I have put upon the extracts from Papias. The Hebrew book attributed to Matthew will be the origin of the portion of the gospel which deals in the interpretation of Messianic prophecies, and the Greek book attributed to Mark may be the nucleus of the portion of the gospel containing the discourses of Jesus.

Now is there anything to be said against this theory? I think there can be no doubt at all that the quotations which are independent translations from the Hebrew indicate a Hebrew or Aramaic original, but it is not so certain that the quotations agreeing with the LXX indicate that the work which contains them was not originally written in Hebrew or some language other than Greek, or did not contain Hebrew

quotations. For in translating into Greek there would no doubt be a tendency to assimilate the quotations to the LXX. Now the first thing to consider is—Can the resemblance of the quotations in the discourses to the LXX be explained on the supposition of intentional or unintentional assimilation? And now we are at once confronted with the difficulty—that the quotations from the LXX occur exactly in the places where assimilation would be difficult, and an independent translation where the assimilation would be easy. When a quotation is made in the course of a speech and its language worked up into the language of the speech, the temptation to make an independent translation must be very great.

For to adapt the language of the speech to an already existing version must be very difficult. Still greater must be the difficulty where there is a mere allusion and not a quotation, to preserve this allusion in the translation, not on the one hand obscuring it altogether or on the other turning it into a quotation. Yet many such allusions to the LXX are to be found in the gospels, and, with the doubtful exception I have mentioned, not one, as Davidson concedes, to the Hebrew.

This argument is strengthened when it is recollected that it is assumed on all sides that the gospel would not, properly speaking, be written in Hebrew but in a language having a relation to it, described as Aramaic or Aramaean; an allusion therefore would pass from Hebrew to Aramaic. As thus disguised, how very difficult would be the process of producing the resemblance to the LXX in a Greek version! Thus in Matthew xxvi. 64, Jesus says:—

'Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven (*ἀπ' ἄρτι ὀψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*).'

This contains an allusion to Daniel vii. 13, and also to Psalm cx.

Daniel vii. 13, according to the proper LXX version, may be rendered thus:—

'I beheld in a vision of the night, and lo, in the clouds of heaven one came as a son of man (*Ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο*).'

Or, according to the version of Theodotion, which in the case of the book of Daniel supplanted the LXX in the primitive church:—

'I beheld in a vision of the night, and lo, with the clouds of heaven one coming as a son of man (*Ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ, μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος*).'

The words of Psalm cx., to which allusion is made, are as follows:—'The Lord saith unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.' According to the LXX—*Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, κ.τ.λ.*

We see therefore that the passage in Matthew blends together allusions to two distinct passages in the Old Testament which have no connection whatever with each other; that as far as the allusion goes the very words of the LXX are used in both cases, that is, of course, allowing for the grammatical changes rendered necessary by the form of the allusion.

There are in this way repeated eight words out of

the passage in Daniel and three out of the passage in the Psalms. The allusion in one respect approximates more nearly to Theodotion than to the LXX, that is in the use of the participle *ἐρχόμενον*. But this is too natural a change to lay stress on. The parallel passage in Mark agrees with Theodotion in the use of the preposition *μετά* instead of *ἐπί*, that is according to the weight of authority, though one uncial G and some other authorities read *ἐπί*. However, this would not be enough to raise an inference of the use of Theodotion by Mark or even of an assimilation to his text, as the allusion to the same passage in Daniel in the Apocalypse (i. 7), which must be older than both Mark and Theodotion, has *μετά* instead of *ἐπί*.¹

Now there are several points to be noticed upon the production of a resemblance of this sort. What is to suggest to the supposed translator that the passage disguised in the Aramaic is an allusion to the particular text of Daniel or the Psalms? Having found this out by the process of turning it into Hebrew and Chaldee, he has to find what words are intended to reproduce the words of Daniel and the Psalm.

He must then further compare these with the LXX so as to get the corresponding rendering into Greek, being careful meanwhile not to quote exactly, and so turn the allusion into a quotation. Supposing this part of the gospel originally written in Greek, the resemblance arises naturally from the effect upon the mind of the writer of his recollection of the Greek version.

But when a quotation is to be made independently,

¹ As to the antiquity of the version of Daniel found in most copies of the LXX, and ascribed to Theodotion, see Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, 4th edit. p. 595.

not worked into the context of any speech, as in the case of the Messianic prophecies, which are quoted to show their fulfilment, the assimilation to the LXX might be made with ease.

But the strongest argument against the discourses having originally quoted the Hebrew, in whatever language they were written, is to be found in the fact that in places where the sense of the LXX differs from that of the Hebrew, the LXX agrees with the context of the passage, which the Hebrew does not.

I will give two illustrations. In the narrative of the temptation, when Satan tries to persuade Jesus to fall down and worship him, Jesus answers him, 'It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'—Matthew iv. 10. *Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.*

This quotation follows the LXX. The emphatic word is 'only,' and is to be found in that version, Deut. vi. 13, according to the LXX, *Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου φοβηθήσῃ καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.*¹

If we turn to Deut. vi. 13, we read in the revised version translated direct from the Hebrew, 'Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God and serve him,' where that word is wanting. If this be substituted for the quotation from the LXX, it would make a comparatively flat answer. It would be strange that the force of the expression should be so much improved by a translation.

To take another illustration. In Matthew xv. Jesus accuses certain Pharisees and scribes of transgressing the commandment of God because of their

¹ The Alexandrine Codex reads *προσκυνήσεις* in place of *φοβηθήσῃ*.

tradition, instancing the permitting a son to make a gift to the temple instead of honouring, which I suppose means supporting, his father. He then goes on:—

'Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, "This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; but in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the commandments of men."'

This quotation is taken from the LXX, with, according to the better texts of Matthew, the omission of some phrases, and at all events fairly represents the meaning of that version, and as so construed describes the practice condemned by Jesus. It is indeed possible that the LXX ought to be construed 'Teaching the precepts and doctrines of men;' but still, even if the word *καί* is retained, as of course it should be, it is possible to construe the sentence as a double accusative, 'Teaching as their precepts even the doctrines of men.' But turning to the version of the passage translated direct from the Hebrew, we read:—

'For as much as this people with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear of me is a commandment of men which hath been taught them, therefore behold I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people,' &c.

Here we see the charge is wholly different; it is not that the people substitute for the commandments of God the commandments of men which are inconsistent, but that they fear God, which no doubt is itself a commandment of God, not because it is such, but because it is a commandment of men. It will be seen, therefore, that the text, as appearing in the Hebrew, would not answer the purpose for which the quotation is

made; it would not describe the practice condemned by Jesus. It follows, therefore, that the passage must have been originally written by some one who derived his knowledge of Isaiah from the LXX version, and therefore, we may conclude, in Greek. There is no possibility here of avoiding this conclusion, by supposing the quotation to have been assimilated to the LXX. If this were done, the whole of the context must have been altered to fit the quotation, which under the circumstances is impossible.

We see, therefore, that an examination of the canonical gospel of Matthew strongly supports the conclusion that it is derived from two sources—one Hebrew, or at all events which quoted the Old Testament in Hebrew, and the other Greek, and the Hebrew source related exclusively to the Messianic prophecies, and might, therefore, be such a book as Papias attributed to Matthew, if I have interpreted his meaning aright.

It must be noticed that of the quotations we have been considering which show traces of being independent translations from the Hebrew, one only is to be found in any other of the gospels besides Matthew, that from Malachi iii. 3, 'Behold I send my messenger before thy face,' &c., which is found also in identical words in Mark and Luke. Now, assuming that the writers of the three synoptic gospels made use of common written materials, it is an interesting inquiry whether this difference is produced by the writer of Matthew having inserted these quotations in the text, or by the writers of Mark and Luke having struck them out. Of the eleven quotations to be considered, four occur in the early chapters of Matthew, and

another in the narrative of the repentance and death of Judas, where the narrative of Matthew is not parallel to Mark and Luke. This reduces the number to be compared to six, for of course whatever induced a variation in the facts recorded would account for the omission of the prophecies of which those facts were stated to be a fulfilment. Of these six, one is in fact contained in all three synoptic gospels. The contexts of the passages in which four of the remaining five occur, do not afford any certain indication whether the quotations have been inserted by the author of Matthew, or left out by the authors of Mark and Luke.

The remaining case, which is that of the quotation contained in Matthew xii. 18-21, I will consider at length.

Matthew and Mark both contain the account of the healing of the man with the withered hand in nearly the same words, from the conclusion of which they run as follows:—

Matthew xii. 18-21.

Then saith he to the man,
Stretch forth thine hand.
And he stretched it forth;
and it was restored whole,
as the other. But the
Pharisees went out and took
counsel against him, how
they might destroy him.
And Jesus perceiving it
withdrew from thence; and
many followed him, and he
healed them all.

Mark iii. 5-12.

He saith unto the man,
Stretch forth thy hand. And
he stretched it forth; and
his hand was restored.
And the Pharisees went
out and straightway with
the Herodians took counsel,
how they might destroy him.
And Jesus with his disciples
withdrew to the sea; and a
great multitude from Galilee
followed him, and from
Judaea, and from Jerusalem,
and from Idumaea, and from

beyond Jordan and about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, hearing what great things he did, came unto him. And he spake to his disciples, that a little boat should wait on him because of the crowd, lest they should throng him. For he had healed many; insomuch that as many as had plagues pressed upon him that they might touch him. And the unclean spirits whensoever they beheld him fell down before him and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God.

And He charged them much that they should not make him known.

And charged them that they should not make him known, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying,

Behold my servant whom I have chosen;

My beloved in whom my soul is well pleased:

I will put my Spirit upon him.

And he shall declare judgment to the Gentiles.

He shall not strive, nor cry aloud.

Neither shall any one hear his voice in the streets.

A bruised reed shall he not break,

And smoking flax shall he not quench,

Till he send forth judgment unto victory.

And in his name shall the Gentiles hope.

These narratives are evidently taken from a common written source. They differ in two respects. Matthew, instead of the detailed description of the healing of the great multitude, including strangers from Idumaea and beyond Jordan and about Tyre and Sidon, has shortly, 'Many followed him and he healed them.' On the other hand, this gospel sets out the passage from Isaiah which is not found in Mark. It will be noticed that the words immediately preceding this quotation are nearly identical with the concluding words in the extract from Mark.

Matthew xii. 16.

Mark iii. 12.

καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα καὶ πολλὰ ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς
μὴ φανερὸν αὐτὸν ποιήσωσιν, ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν φανερὸν ποιήσω-
σιν. ἵνα πληρωθῇ, κ.τ.λ.

Now, is it possible to determine what was the original text of this passage? Did the writer of Matthew abridge the account of the healing of the multitude, or the writer of Mark amplify it? Did the writer of Matthew insert the quotation from Isaiah, or the writer of Mark leave it out? Both questions admit of a satisfactory answer, which is this: both writers abridged their original, the writer of Matthew by substituting a short summary for the detailed narrative of the healing of the multitude, and the writer of Mark by omitting the quotation, so that the

original might be restored by adding to the extract from Mark the latter part of the extract from Matthew containing the quotation from the words, 'That it might be fulfilled,' &c.

This may be shown from the following considerations. The material part of the prophecy is contained in the words, 'He shall declare judgment to the Gentiles,' and again, 'And in his name shall the Gentiles hope.'¹ But Matthew's narrative contains nothing of which this could be a fulfilment; on the other hand, in Mark we read of a great multitude from Idumaea and beyond Jordan and about Tyre and Sidon, to which the prophecy is evidently intended to refer.

This conclusion is confirmed when we look at the parallel passage in Luke vi. 17. There we read of 'a great number of the people from all Judaea and Jerusalem, and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, which came to hear him and to be healed of their diseases.'

For a passage analogous to what I suppose the original narrative, altered differently in Matthew and Mark, to have been, I may refer to Matthew iv. 13-16.

Before leaving this topic, it may be as well to remark that the reason of the writer of Matthew omitting the words containing the description of the great multitude from Galilee, Judaea, Jerusalem, Idumaea, beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon, is this. In his anxiety to assemble a large audience for the sermon on the Mount, he transplanted some of them into another place (see chapter iv. 23-25 and chapter v.), and so left the prophecy standing without its fulfilment.

¹ Compare the comment of Justin on the same passage: 'Is it then on the patriarch Jacob that the Gentiles and you yourselves hope?' *Dial.* c. 135.

The consideration, therefore, of this passage supports the conclusion that the Messianic prophecies, which are independent translations from the Hebrew, formed part of the material common to the three synoptic gospels, and that it was the writers of Mark and Luke who struck out, and *not the writer of Matthew who inserted these passages.*

CHAPTER IX

SOURCE OF MESSIANIC PROPHECIES COMMON TO MATTHEW
AND JUSTIN MARTYR

IF a collection of Old Testament prophecies relating to the Messiah existed in the early Church, we might expect to find traces of it in other books besides the canonical gospels, and the first place to which one naturally turns to test this expectation is Justin Martyr.

Upon his quotations, Dr. Abbott, in his article on the Gospels in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' after observing that in long passages he generally quotes the LXX accurately, makes the following remark: 'Messianic passages, even when long, are modified (sometimes with a closer return to the Hebrew original) by Christian use and adaptation to Christ.' It must be noted that Dr. Abbott is dealing with Justin's quotations from the LXX for the purpose of combating the inference that might be drawn from his evangelical quotations, that he did not use the canonical gospels, by showing that he quoted the LXX with equal inaccuracy. He has to make the admission that in his long quotations Justin quoted the LXX accurately, but out of this admission he makes the exception I have quoted. So far as my own reading of Justin goes, I should say that he always quotes the LXX accurately, except in Messianic prophecies—that is, with such

accuracy as to leave no doubt as to the source of the quotations. But I can make no claim to have compared the whole of his quotations. But the converse is not always true; there are Messianic passages in Justin which appear to have been quoted from the LXX.

But it must be borne in mind that Justin's quotations have certainly to some extent—possibly to a considerable extent—been assimilated by his transcribers. This can be proved to have taken place with regard to a quotation from Psalm lxxxii. in his dialogue with Trypho (cap. 124), which Justin gives expressly as according to the Hebrew text (*ὡς μὲν ὑμεῖς ἐξηγεῖσθε*), and then goes on to point out how the LXX differs (*Ἐν δὲ τῇ τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα ἐξηγήσει εἴρηται*). But when the passage is looked at, it is found to agree with the LXX verbatim. In fact, it has been assimilated by some copyist or editor in such a way as to destroy the sense of Justin altogether. It is unlikely that such a stupid piece of assimilation is the only specimen to be found in Justin. It is more likely to be the work of some editor who heedlessly carried out some general plan of assimilating the quotations. The inference to be drawn is that much greater weight is to be attached to Justin's differences from, than to his agreement with, canonical books.¹

There are eleven quotations contained in Matthew which, according to the theory of Bleek, as explained above, might be expected to depart from the LXX. Of these five are to be found in Justin.²

¹ See note at end of chapter.

² In arriving at this statement I have relied upon the tables of quotations from the Old Testament contained in Dr. Davidson's *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, and on the index to J. C. T. Otto's edition of Justin Martyr.

1. Isaiah vii. 14: 'Behold a virgin shall conceive,' &c.; quoted Matthew i. 23, Justin, 1 Ap. c. 33, and with its context before and after Dial. cc. 43 and 66, and partly quoted i. Ap. c. 33, Dial. cc. 67, 68, 71 and 84.

2. Micah v. 2: 'But thou, Bethlehem,' &c.; quoted Matthew ii. 6, Justin, 1 Ap. c. 34 and Dial. c. 78.

3. Jeremiah xxxi. 15: 'A voice was heard in Ramah,' &c.; quoted Matthew ii. 18, Justin, Dial. c. 78.

4. Isaiah xlii. 1-4: 'Behold my servant,' &c.; quoted Matthew xii. 17-21, Justin, Dial. c. 123 and c. 135.

5. Zechariah ix. 9: 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion,' &c.; quoted Matthew xxi. 5, Justin, 1 Ap. c. 35, Dial. c. 53.

Every one of these quotations as it occurs in Justin agrees with Matthew in something or other in which Matthew differs from the LXX.

In quoting Isaiah vii. 14 in the 'Apology,' Justin departs from the LXX considerably more than Matthew does, but his subsequent quotations of the entire passage agree with the LXX, according to the Vatican text, except in one word in which the two quotations differ both from each other and from the LXX, but in which the last quotation agrees with Matthew. The partial quotations, as far as they go, Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, agree exactly with the LXX. These partial quotations usually have λήψεται, but one immediately following the quotation above cited from the 'Apology' like it, has ἔξει, and again in chap. 43 of the 'Dialogue' Justin declares

that the Jews said that Isaiah did not say, Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει, but Ἰδοὺ ἡ νεάνις ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται καὶ τέξεται υἱόν.

In quoting Micah v. 2 and Jeremiah xxxi. 15, Justin agrees with Matthew exactly, except that in both places he fails to quote the last two words of Micah v. 2, quoted in Matthew, and both Matthew and Justin depart largely from the LXX.

Justin quotes Isaiah xlii. 1-4 and Zechariah ix. 9 twice. In both instances Justin's quotation resembles the LXX more nearly than Matthew does; in both instances Justin agrees with Matthew in some points in which he differs from the LXX, and in both instances the latter of Justin's quotations agrees more nearly than the former with the LXX.

The quotations from Isaiah vii. 14, Micah v. 2, and Zechariah ix. 9 are given by Matthew from 'the prophet,' but by Justin the quotation from Isaiah and the quotation from Micah in the 'Apology' are referred correctly to Isaiah and Micah, and the quotation from Zechariah in the 'Apology' incorrectly to Zephaniah, and in the 'Dialogue' correctly to Zechariah. On the other hand the quotation from Jeremiah xxxi. 15, which Matthew refers correctly to Jeremiah, is given by Justin as from the prophet.

Both Matthew and Justin agree in correctly referring the remaining quotation to Isaiah, and in the 'Dialogue' Justin, like Matthew, refers the quotation from Micah to the prophet.

It will be noticed that in only one of the cases in which Justin agrees exactly with Matthew in the words, does he agree also in the reference; and in the other case in which he agrees in the reference he

differs in the words, and that passing by the last two words of the quotation from Micah, in all cases, except in the quotations of Isaiah vii. 14 in the 'Dialogue,' in the extent of the quotation Justin agrees with Matthew, by which I mean that the quotation begins and ends in the same place, Justin or his transcribers sometimes supplying intermediate phrases from the LXX, which are omitted in Matthew.

I will now consider more closely Justin's quotation of Isaiah vii. 14. He quotes it in his 'First Apology,' cap. 33, in the following words: 'Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν καὶ ἐροῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός.' (Behold the virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall say in reference to his name, God with us.)

It will be noticed that the passage as quoted by Justin agrees with the passage as quoted in Matthew in all the differences of the last-named passage from the LXX.

1. It has the third person plural of the verb ἐροῦσιν, 'they shall say,' instead of the second person singular of the verb καλέσεις, 'thou shalt call,' or taking the reading of the Sinaitic Codex, καλέσει, 'thou shalt call' or 'she shall call,' where, though Justin agrees with Matthew in the difference as regards the number and person, he diverges further from the LXX than Matthew, in using a different verb.

2. It has the words Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός, 'God with us,' also found in Matthew, but not in the LXX, but here again the divergence of Justin from the LXX is much greater than the divergence of Matthew, for in Matthew these words are added as an explanation of

the word Emmanuel, used in the LXX, while in Justin they take the place of that word itself.

When we were comparing the passage as quoted in Matthew with the LXX, we remarked that the *primâ facie* impression produced would be that it was originally taken from the LXX.

We do not think that would be the impression produced by the passage from Justin. There the latter part of the quotation appears an entirely independent version, though the former part would seem to have been either originally influenced by a recollection of the LXX, or to have been subsequently assimilated to it.

It will now be necessary to consider how far this *primâ facie* impression is affected by the other quotations of the passage by Justin. Justin quotes the whole passage with its context before and after—that is to say, from the tenth to the sixteenth verse inclusive—twice in his dialogue with Trypho. Having made the quotation the first time, he diverges from the topic to answer some objections of Trypho, and then, after a considerable interval, expressly returns to it again, and in so doing repeats the quotation he had made before the digression. Both passages, with a few exceptions, are intended to be, and in fact are, verbatim quotations from the LXX, and therefore must have been intended to be exactly like one another. But, notwithstanding this, there are a few differences between them. These differences must, under the circumstances, be mere errors, either on the part of Justin himself or his transcribers. On the other hand, where the two quotations agree in

differences from the LXX, we may be confident that we have to deal with what Justin intentionally wrote.

The differences from the LXX, not noticing recognised various readings in which both passages agree, are as follows:—

(1) In verse 16 both passages have *πονηρά* after *ἀπειθεῖ* instead of *πονηρία*.

(2) Both passages interpolate in verse 16 words accurately quoted from the LXX version of the fourth verse of the following chapter, making it run, 'For before the child shall know good or evil, he refuses evil by choosing good. For before the child shall know to call father or mother, he shall receive the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria before the King of the Assyrians.'

(3) In the same verse 16 both passages read *καταληφθήσεται*, instead of *καταλειφθήσεται*, meaning 'the land shall be taken' instead of 'the land shall be forsaken.'

(4) Also in the same verse 16 both passages read *σκληρῶς οἶσεις* for *φοβῇ*, making the meaning 'the land shall be taken, which thou shalt bear hardly,' instead of 'the land shall be forsaken, which thou fearest.'

(5) In verse 17 both passages have *ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς* instead of *ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας*.

Besides these differences, in which both quotations agree, the former quotation has the following differences from the LXX not found in the latter.

(6) In verse 13, *Ἀκούετε* for *Ἀκούσατε*.

(7) In the same verse 13, *ὁ* before *οἶκος*.

(8) In verse 15, *καὶ* before *ἐκλέξασθαι*.

The latter quotation has the following differences from the LXX, which are not found in the former:—

(9) In verse 16, *κακὸν ἢ ἀγαθόν* for *ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν*.

(10) In verse 17, *τῶν* omitted before *Ἀσσυρίων*.

(11) Besides this, in verse 14 the former quotation has *καλέσεται*, the third person singular of the future middle, and the latter quotation has *καλέσουσι*, the third person plural of the future active, where the LXX has the second person singular of the future active of the same verb.

(12) Besides these differences from the LXX, in verse 15 the former quotation has *ἐκλέξασθαι*, the reading of the Vatican, and the latter *ἐκλέξεται*, the reading of the Alexandrine codex.

(6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) are in all probability mere errors of transcription, (12) being probably due to some copyist correcting one of the passages according to a text of the LXX which he had before him, which happened to differ from the text used by Justin.

Of the others, (1) and (5) may be different readings of the LXX, and (3) looks very like a blunder of Justin's. But we shall have to notice another view of it: (2) is an instance of the running together of distinct passages, which is a marked characteristic of Justin's quotations of Messianic prophecies, and is rendered the more peculiar in this case by the general exactness of the quotation.

Before considering the remaining differences, we must here remark that Justin quoted from a written document. The discrepancies which we have noticed

are not of a kind to raise any presumption that the quotations were made from memory.

To pass on now to (12), the reading *καλέσεται* would make the meaning like that of the English version, 'a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name,' &c.

Mr. Cheyne renders 'the young woman is with child and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name,' &c., which, as regards the word in question, is the same. *Καλέσεται* is probably, therefore, a more correct rendering of the Hebrew than either the *καλέσεις* or *καλέσετε* of the LXX, or the *καλέσουσι* which is to be found in Matthew¹ and in the later of the quotations we are considering. In ancient times there appear to have been a good many different renderings of this word—that is to say, renderings which differ in voice, number, and person. Thus the LXX, according to the Vatican and Alexandrine codices, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, have the second person singular of the future active *καλέσεις*, the Sinaitic codex has the second person singular of the future middle or the third person singular of the future active *καλέσει*.² Justin in this place has the third person singular of the future middle. The Vulgate has the third person singular of the future passive, 'vocabitur;' Irenaeus (lib. iii. cap. xxi. 4) has the second person plural of the future active, 'vocabitis,' and Matthew and Justin in other places have the third person plural of the future active.

¹ It is found also in a few cursives of the LXX, but may be there set down to assimilation.

² Possibly this may be a mere copyist's blunder. The scribe was not too particular about his sigmas; a few words back he has *γατρι* for *γαστρι*.

As regards the passages now under consideration, I think we may be certain that Justin wrote the same word in both places, and that of the two readings one or other is due to the error of a transcriber; and supposing either *καλέσεται* or *καλέσουσι* to have been the original reading, there seems no difficulty in supposing the other to have arisen from it by mere error of transcription. On the whole, it would seem more probable that Justin used the same voice, number, and person that he made use of in the 'Apology'—that is to say, that he wrote *καλέσουσι*. Of course it is possible that Justin originally wrote *καλέσεις* or *καλέσετε* with the LXX in both passages, and that the copyists have made different blunders in each; but I do not think this so probable. There would be two errors instead of one, and if he had *καλέσεις*, the common reading, in neither case would the transcriptional probability be so great.

There remains to consider (4). In this case Justin, for some reason or other, has clearly departed from the LXX. It is not easy to divine any object for the variation. Having regard to the evidence afforded by the passage in the 'Apology' that he had some other version of this passage, as probable a cause as any would appear to be a mixture of versions. That is to say, that these words belonged to some independent version which Justin in some manner mixed with the LXX.

It should be noticed that the principal differences from the LXX follow one another consecutively—i.e. after the interpolation of the words from chapter viii. The text reads on, *καὶ καταληφθήσεται ἡ γῆ ἡν σὺ σκληρῶς οἴσεις*. This is very favourable to the theory

of a mixture. Justin, or the authority he followed, must have turned to another text to make the interpolation, and may have followed it for several words further than was necessary. On the other hand the meaning, 'The land shall be taken, which thou shalt bear hardly,' might suit the desired interpretation better than 'The land shall be forsaken, which thou fearest,' interpreting the words as referring to the overthrow of the Jewish nation by the Romans. Still, even if this was the reason for the intentional retention of the words, they must have come from somewhere, and they are more likely to have formed part of an independent version of the passage with which Justin was acquainted than to have been an original version of his own. On the whole, the examination of these quotations in the 'Dialogue' rather strengthens than otherwise the inference to be drawn from the quotation in the 'Apology,' that Justin had access to some version of that passage, independent of the LXX.

The argument that Justin followed some authority different from the LXX is not a little strengthened by the form in which the passage is quoted by Tertullian: '—

'Sic Esaias dicit. Andite Domus David, non pusillum vobis certamen cum hominibus, quoniam Deus praestat certamen, propter hoc ipse Deus dabit vobis signum: Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitis nomen ejus Emmanuel, quod interpretatur nobiscum Deus. Butyrum et mel manducabit: quoniam prius quam cognoscat infans vocare patrem aut matrem accipiet virtutem Damasci et spolia Samariae adversus regem Assyriorum.'

It will be seen that Tertullian here runs together the words out of the eighth chapter of Isaiah with the

¹ C. Jud. 9.

words out of the seventh, in the same way as Justin; and yet it does not appear that Justin is the source of the quotation. It contains the conflate rendering, 'Immanuel which is, being interpreted, God with us,' to be found in Matthew. If, therefore, Tertullian followed Justin, he must have assimilated the passage to Matthew; but it is against this that he has the word 'vocabitis,' agreeing with the ordinary reading of the LXX instead of the 'vocabunt' of Matthew. It would seem probable, therefore, that Tertullian followed the same authority that was followed by both Justin and Matthew; but in a later stage than that in which it was before either of them in which it had been further assimilated to the LXX.

A question it may be desirable to clear up with regard to the differences between the quotation in the 'Apology' and the LXX is whether those differences can in any way be traced to any other version of the Old Testament current in the second century.

The extant fragments of Origen's 'Hexapla'¹ enable us to give the passage now under consideration, as it appeared in the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

According to Aquila and Theodotion it was as follows: 'Ἰδοὺ ἡ νεάνις ἐν γαστρὶ συλλαμβάνει καὶ τίκτει υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἑμμανουήλ.

According to Symmachus: 'Ἰδοὺ ἡ νεάνις συλλαμβάνει καὶ τίκτει υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἑμμανουήλ.

All of which may be rendered sufficiently exactly for our present purpose:—

¹ Migne, P. G. tom. xvi. This is the source from which all my statements as to the *Hexapla* are taken.

'Behold the young woman is pregnant and brings forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Emmanuel.'

A glance at these versions is enough to show that the differences between Justin or Matthew and the LXX cannot have arisen from any of them.

We have noticed that in verse 10 some of the MSS. of the LXX read *ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται*, and others *ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει*. It is a question whether Matthew and Justin derive the latter reading from the LXX, or whether the various reading in the LXX is attributable to assimilation with Matthew. Upon this it may be remarked that on the occasions where Justin is undoubtedly quoting the LXX, he uses *λήψεται*, and he also, for the most part, uses *λήψεται* in his partial quotations of or allusions to the passage. It would appear, therefore, that in Justin's time *λήψεται* must have been a well-established reading of the LXX, probably the only reading known to Justin. It may also be noticed that the passage is cited by Origen in his book against Celsus, lib. i. cap. 34, with the reading *λήψεται*. This, I believe, is the only citation by Origen which has any weight on the present question; for short citations, without the context before or after, might as well come from Matthew. It may also be remarked that no ground of transcriptional probability can be alleged why *λήψεται* should be substituted for *ἔξει* or *vice versa*.¹ The most probable ground of the various reading would appear to be assimilation to some other text, which, in this case, must be Matthew. It would seem there-

¹ Dr. Hatch cites in favour of *λήψεται*, Codd. A S, xii. 26, 41, 90, 106, 144, 239, 300, but I suspect has made some slip. See *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 197.

fore more probable that the reading *ἔξει* in the LXX is due to assimilation to Matthew, than that Justin and the writer of Matthew derived the word from copies of the LXX which contained it in their day. We may therefore reckon this word as a third difference from the LXX in which Justin and Matthew agree.

To return to the other question, whether the agreement between the quotations in Matthew and Justin, in their differences from the LXX, does not show that these quotations had a common origin which was not the LXX.

Upon this question some light may be thrown by the passages cited from the 'Hexapla.'

All the versions agree in substituting *συλλαμβάνει*, which I have rendered 'is pregnant,' for the *λήψεται* or *ἐν γαστρὶ λήψεται* of the LXX, in the place where Matthew and Justin have *ἔξει*.

This agreement is double-edged: on the one hand it would tend to point out *συλλαμβάνει* as the word which would appear more obviously appropriate to a writer of the second century, and so give greater weight to the inference of a common origin, other than the LXX, for the quotations in Matthew and Justin to be derived from their agreement in the use of the less appropriate word *ἔξει*.

On the other hand, it points out an agreement in the use of the future tense which might not otherwise have been noticed between Justin and Matthew and the LXX, which might be supposed due to the influence of that version.

To determine how this double edge really falls, it will be necessary to consider the true meaning of the original of the passage in Isaiah, and the proclivities

of the different translators. To determine the true meaning of the original I will consider the different ways in which it has been rendered.

In the Vulgate it is rendered, 'Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitur nomen ejus Emmanuel.'

'Behold a (or the) virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel.'

In the authorised English version it is rendered, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Immanuel.'

In the revised version it is rendered in the text: 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and shall bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel;' or, according to the marginal readings, 'Behold the maiden is with child and beareth a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.'

As rendered by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne it is, 'Behold the young woman is with child and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.'

Mr. Cheyne gives his reasons for the rendering 'is with child' as follows: 'So we should render, and not "shall be with child," in view of the parallel passage, Gen. xvi. 2 (Judg. xiii. 5, 7, is doubtful) and of verses 15, 16.' The parallel passage in Genesis appears to consist of identical words addressed to Hagar, in a context which shows that a present, and not a future, must be intended, and verses 15 and 16 appear to raise the same inference in the passage under consideration.

However, Mr. Cheyne's reasons do not appear to show that there is any obvious grammatical impropriety in the use of the future; and though, therefore, one may suspect that the rendering in which he concurs with the margin of the revised version and the three 'Hexapla' translators is correct, the adoption

of the future does not appear to be so forced that the agreement of Justin and Matthew in the tense should be taken as evidence of the influence of the LXX to counterbalance their difference in the word.

But it may be further urged that the agreement of the three translators, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, in departing from the LXX ought to show that their rendering was the obvious one to adopt, according to the state of knowledge in the second century.

To deal with this argument we must consider the proclivities of these translators: Aquila was a Jew, Symmachus and Theodotion were Ebionites. The object of all three, therefore, was to give a rendering of the passage in Isaiah that was inconsistent with its application to Jesus of Nazareth, or, at all events, with his parthenogenesis.

This takes very much from any weight that might be attached to their agreement in the use of the present tense instead of the future, as showing that it would appear in the second century the preferable rendering, and therefore tracing up the future of Matthew and Justin to the influence of the LXX; but it does not at all detract from the similar argument to be derived from their choice of the word. On the other hand, when it is remembered that the object of Aquila was to give the exact meaning of the Hebrew, of Symmachus to write in good Greek, and that the practice of Theodotion was not to depart unnecessarily from the LXX, it will be seen that their agreement in the use of one word is evidence that it was the obvious word for any one at that time to adopt for the purpose.

Again, it will be noticed that all these versions

agree with the LXX in the use of *καλέσεις* in the second person singular, instead of *καλέσουσιν* or *ἐροῦσιν* in the third person plural, which not a little emphasises the weight to be attached to the agreement between Matthew and Justin in their divergence from the LXX.

But it will be further noticed that Matthew and Justin agree not merely in having the third person, but in having the third person plural; in that they differ from all the other authorities I have cited; which again affords strong evidence of a common origin for the difference.¹

We may therefore conclude with confidence that the quotations in Matthew and Justin have a common origin, which is not the LXX.

The next point to consider is which form of the quotation is the older—that in Matthew or that in Justin.

There are three reasons which concur in proving that the form of the quotation in Justin is the older.

(1) If the original were originally in the form contained in Justin, the alteration to the form in Matthew is readily explicable as a partial assimilation to the LXX; but no reason can be given for altering the form in Matthew into the form in Justin.

(2) If the form in Matthew was altered into the form in Justin, the person who made the alteration must have preserved unaltered every point in which Matthew differed from the LXX, a thing unlikely to

¹ *καλέσουσι* also appears in some MSS. of the citation in Origen *Contra Celsum* noticed above, but it is probably due to assimilation to Matthew. The passage after the word *Ἐμμανουήλ* runs on, *ὅπερ ἐρμηνεύεται μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός*.

be effected, either by accident or design—for which latter there was no motive. On the other hand, if the change was made in the contrary direction, the preservation of these differences is easily explicable: they merely show that to that extent the intention to assimilate to the LXX was imperfectly executed.

(3) The LXX transliterates and Justin translates the Hebrew word for Emmanuel, while Matthew both transliterates and translates it. The rendering therefore of Matthew stands to the rendering of Justin and the LXX in the position of a composite reading, and by the ordinary rule of criticism must therefore be assumed to be later than either of the simple readings it combines.

We may therefore conclude that the writer of the first gospel, or some person he copied, had the quotation before him in the form given by Justin, and this leads to the inference that at all events the latter part of the quotation comes from some version of the passage independent of the LXX.

It has, however, been contended that the former part of the quotation certainly came direct from the LXX, on the following grounds, which I must consider.

This portion of the quotation, as is well known, formed the foundation-stone of the faith of those among the primitive Christians who succeeded in transmitting their belief to the Catholic Church. When the Aramaic-speaking Christians of Palestine and other Ebionites asserted that as a matter of fact Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation, they replied that this was impossible, as it was prophesied that the Messiah should be the son

of a virgin. When the Ebionites went further and denied the prophecy, pointing in confirmation to the more accurate versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, a myth was invented that Ptolemy had shut up each of the seventy translators in a separate cell and that so, without any communication with the others, each had produced a version of the entire Old Testament, and when they had done it was found that all the seventy versions agreed verbatim. After such a manifest miracle it was contended that the LXX version must be absolutely accurate.¹

As the LXX version of this passage came ultimately to be so strongly relied on, it has been supposed that that version must have been the source from which the Messianic prophecy in question was originally taken; but that does not follow.

The LXX is long anterior to the Christian era. The version it contains therefore of the passage in question, although erroneous, expresses the meaning which perhaps many Jews put upon it at that time, and which therefore may have been put upon it by some persons after the Christian era, altogether irrespective of its application to Jesus of Nazareth. Besides, even if correctly understood in this particular, the passage may still have been capable of being applied in some way as a Messianic prophecy, and might therefore be included in a collection of Messianic prophecies compiled in the Hebrew, even by a man who had never questioned the natural generation of Jesus.

No doubt the aptness of the words of the LXX to

¹ Justin? *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, cap. xiii.; Irenaeus, *Contra Haer.* lib. iii. cap. xxi. ss. 1, 2, 3.

express the Catholic doctrine, accounts for the complete assimilation of the commencement of the prophecy to that version.

This history of the quotation does not, therefore, afford any reason why it should not have formed one of a collection of Messianic prophecies made and circulated in Hebrew.

The remaining subject to refer to is the context of the quotations in Justin, and, as regards the first, it is found in the same context with an evangelical quotation; which would probably indicate that the source was a gospel of some sort.

The quotation is stated by Justin to be spoken by an angel of God to the Virgin and to be, 'As those who have related all things about our Saviour Jesus Christ taught, whom we believe' (*ὡς οἱ ἀπομνημονεύσαντες πάντα τὰ περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξαν οἷς ἐπιστεύσαμεν*).¹

It is as follows:—

'Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb of the Holy Ghost and bring forth a son, and he shall be called the son of the Most High, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins' (*Ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν*).'

The words down to 'Jesus' might be a summary of the words stated in the first chapter of Luke to be addressed to Mary on the occasion of the annunciation by the angel Gabriel, and the words from 'And thou shalt call his name,' &c., down to the end agree

¹ 1 Ap. c. 33.

exactly with the words stated in the first chapter of Matthew to have been spoken by an angel of the Lord in a dream to Joseph. On the other hand, these latter words agree exactly with words stated in the 'Protevangelium' of James to have been spoken by the angel of God to Mary on the occasion of the annunciation, and the former words might just as well be taken from the 'Protevangelium' according to the text of Fabricius as from Luke, for they have exactly the same degree of agreement with it, and further it must be noticed that Justin agrees with the same text of the 'Protevangelium' in describing the angel as an angel of God, while in Luke the angel is described by name as Gabriel, and in Matthew as the angel of the Lord. With some texts of 'Protevangelium' the agreement of the former part of the words spoken would be closer than with Luke. On the whole, therefore, if we had to confine ourselves to extant books, it would seem more reasonable to infer that Justin cited 'Protevangelium' accurately, than that he made an inaccurate jumble of Matthew and Luke, and at the same time stumbled into a consecutive narrative and an agreement with 'Protevangelium,' following it up with an emphatic appeal to the authorities he, in common with his fellow Christians, believed (*οἱς ἐπιστεύσαμεν*) as the source of his statement. As a further proof that the putting the latter part of the quotation into the mouth of the angel is not an oversight, it should be noticed that Justin repeats the statement a little further on. 'But the name Jesus in the Hebrew language means the same as saviour in the Greek dialect. Whence also the angel said to the virgin "And thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people

from their sins." ' It is, however, not necessary to assume that Justin cited from 'Protevangelium,' or even that that book was in existence in his day. What is proved is that Justin's account and that in 'Protevangelium' had a common origin. In other words, that there was a gospel extant in Justin's day, which contained the particulars in which Justin and 'Protevangelium' agree, of which Justin made use and which was certainly not our Matthew. These considerations fortify the conclusion we have already come to from considering the language of the quotations in Matthew and Justin, that though these quotations had a common origin different from the LXX, that origin was not Matthew, and would appear to point to the probability that the immediate source from which Justin took the quotation was some gospel which formed a basis for the present canonical Matthew, as well as for 'Protevangelium.' The quotation from Isaiah itself is not found in 'Protevangelium,' but the words put into the mouth of the angel are evidently modelled upon the LXX version of that quotation, which some MSS. of 'Protevangelium' follow closely.

The next quotation from Micah v. 2 follows in the 'Apology' almost immediately. The probability therefore is strong that it comes from the same source as the quotation from Isaiah we have been considering, notwithstanding that it agrees verbatim with Matthew, with the exception of the omission of the last two words *τὸν Ἰσραήλ*, a difference not without weight when we remember that it is repeated in the 'Dialogue.' Justin again differs from Matthew in referring it to

¹ 1 Ap. c. 33.

the prophet by name. After making the quotation Justin goes on speaking of Bethlehem :—

‘ It is a village in the country of the Jews distant thirty-five stadia from Jerusalem, in which Jesus Christ was born ; as also you can learn from the census made under Quirinius, who was your first procurator in Judaea (*ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν τῶν γενομένων ἐπὶ Κυρηνίου τοῦ ὑμετέρου ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πρῶτον γενομένου ἐπιτρόπου*).’¹

Now had Justin had Luke before him when he was making these quotations, or even been acquainted with the work, he would have learned that Quirinius was governor (*ἡγεμών*) of Syria, not procurator of Judaea, when this census was made, and it must be remembered that Justin, having lived in Palestine, was not likely to have confounded the offices. It must be noticed too that Justin appeals to the census in a way Luke never ventures to do. He tells the Emperors that if they looked into it, they would find the birth of Jesus recorded. There is no doubt in such matters that Justin was a man of great faith. But for the present purpose, as the evangelical quotation which I just now considered could not possibly have been concocted out of Matthew without the aid of Luke, anything which shows that Justin had not Luke in his mind just then, tends also to show that there must have been some other source for that quotation than Matthew, and that therefore Matthew is not the source of the two quotations from Isaiah and Micah we have been considering.

The circumstances under which Justin quotes the passage ‘Thou, Bethlehem,’ &c., the second time and the passage from Jeremiah are these. He is explaining

¹ 1 Ap. c. 34.

Isaiah viii. 4, which he quotes accurately from the LXX, as a Messianic prophecy. He construes it thus : ‘ For before the child shall know how to call his father or mother he shall receive the power of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria before the king of the Assyrians.’¹ For the purpose of explaining the fulfilment of this prophecy, Justin sets out the story of the visit of the wise men, whom he always calls the wise men (or perhaps rather I should say wizards) from Arabia and of the slaughter of the Innocents, and in so doing gives the quotations from Micah and Jeremiah exactly as they occur in Matthew, with the exception that he does not quote the concluding words of the former passage *τὸν Ἰσραήλ*. From the position therefore in which these quotations occur, I do not think there can be much doubt that they came from some gospel. The question is whether that is Matthew, and in the main the narrative is consistent with that supposition ; but there is one objection which seems insuperable, and that is the description of the wise men. No one who had been accustomed to the account in Matthew, would ever turn the wise men from the East into the wise men from Arabia, but if any one could have done so, certainly not Justin on this occasion, for he was labouring to show that this visit of the wise men was a fulfilment of the prophecy in Isaiah viii. 4, and he did it in this way. The king of Assyria meant Herod, who was so called on account of his godless and lawless mind. The wise men or wizards were the servants of the evil demon, and when they turned from their evil deeds and worshipped Christ, they were as spoils received by him. But now comes the difficulty. How

¹ Dial. 77.

are they the spoils of Damascus? Justin meets the matter by saying: 'But that Damascus was and is in the land of Arabia, even if it is now assigned to the country called Syrophoenicia, none of you can deny.'¹ But though Justin here says that nobody can deny Damascus was and is in the land of Arabia, it is notwithstanding sufficiently certain that Damascus was and had always been reckoned in Syria, not in Arabia. We may therefore be quite certain, that if Justin had had a gospel to quote from, using such a phrase as 'wise men from the East' instead of 'from Arabia,' he would have been only too glad to adopt it. From his not doing so, we may conclude that our Matthew was not in his hands, at all events in its present state.

This conclusion is supported by some other circumstances. Thus Justin agrees with 'Protevangelium' in saying that the wise men found Jesus in a cave (σπηλαίῳ), instead of a house (οἰκίᾳ) as stated by Matthew; he also differs from Matthew in saying that they found the child in a manger (φάτνη).

Again, Justin makes the wise men say, 'That from a star appearing in the heaven they knew that a king was born in your (i.e. Trypho's) country, and we are come to worship him' (ἐξ ἀστέρος τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ φανέντος ἐγνωκέναι ὅτι βασιλεὺς γεγέννηται ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ὑμῶν καὶ ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτόν),² instead of 'Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we saw his star in the East and are come to worship him' (ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ).³ This difference of language

¹ Dial. c. 78.² Ibid.³ Matthew ii. 2

might be taken merely to be the result of a paraphrase, did it not happen again to bring Justin into agreement with the words put into the mouths of the wise men in 'Protevangelium.'

'We saw a very great star, shining among the stars of heaven, and blotting out the other stars, so that they did not appear, and we knew that the [great] king was born in Israel, and through this we are come to worship him (Εἶδομεν ἀστέρα παρμεγέθη λάμπαντα ἐν τοῖς ἀστροῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀμβλύνοντα τοὺς ἄλλους ἀστέρας ὥστε μὴ φαίνεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐγνώμεν [ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς οὕτως ἐγνώκαμεν] ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς [μέγας] ἐγεννήθη ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτόν).'¹

The words in square brackets indicate various readings.

It will be noticed that not reckoning as a difference the double *ν* in ἐγεννήθη which distinguishes the aorist of γεννάω from the easily confounded and nearly synonymous aorist of γίγνομαι, all the words used by Justin occur in 'Protevangelium,' except that Justin, by reason of his work taking the form of a dialogue with a Jew, substitutes ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ὑμῶν for ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ. Whether the words not found in Justin were omitted by him as unnecessary for his purpose, or whether the writer of 'Protevangelium' amplified a common original, it is not necessary to consider. That Justin either followed 'Protevangelium' or some other original which 'Protevangelium' also followed, and which was not Matthew, is, I think, certain. It should further be noticed that Matthew makes the star to be seen in the east, where, according to Matthew, the wise men came from; Justin and 'Protevangelium' make it to appear

¹ Cap. xxi.

in the heaven. This shows that Justin's materials were consistent with themselves in not bringing the wise men from the East, and therefore were not 'Protevangeli-um,' where the wise men come from the East though the star appears in the heaven, but that Justin and 'Protevangeli-um' must have had a common original which was not Matthew.

In his account of the slaughter of the innocents which follows, Justin again has an important difference from Matthew, which again agrees with the account of the visit of the wisemen contained in 'Protevangeli-um,' at all events according to four MSS. in a point in which that differs from Matthew. Justin says that Herod ordered that absolutely all the children (*πάντας ἀπλῶς τοὺς παῖδας*) in Bethlehem should be slain,¹ instead of the children from two years old and under, and there can be no doubt that these four MSS. contain the true text of 'Protevangeli-um,' for none of the MSS. of that work contain the passage in which Matthew, in order to prepare for the latter statement, makes Herod diligently inquire what time the star appeared.

It must be noticed that the quotations we are considering—Micah v. 2, 'And thou, Bethlehem,' &c., and Jeremiah xxxi. 15, 'A voice was heard in Ramah,' &c.—are not found in most manuscripts of 'Protevangeli-um,' but there are MSS. of that work which contain both of them. Thus, the former, which is found in the text of Fabricius in the same words as in Matthew, is also found very slightly assimilated to the LXX in the MSS. cited by Thilo as Paris B, and the latter,

¹ *Dial.* c. 78.

which is not found in the text of Fabricius, is found in the MSS. cited by Thilo as Paris F.¹

The passage from Zechariah ix. 9 is quoted twice in different language, once in the 'Apology,' where it is wrongly referred to Zeplaniah, and once in the 'Dialogue,' where it is rightly referred to Zechariah. The words of these quotations differ considerably from one another and from Matthew; the former approaching more nearly in some places to the LXX than does Matthew, the latter in some points approaching more nearly and in other points departing further from the LXX than either Matthew or the former quotation.

I will consider the latter quotation first. It differs in language both from Matthew and the LXX, sometimes agreeing with one, sometimes with the other, and sometimes differing from both. It begins thus: 'Rejoice greatly, daughter of Zion (*χαίρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών*), which agrees with the LXX, differing from Matthew which has, 'Toll ye the daughter of Zion' (*Εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών*). It proceeds, 'Raise the warcry' (*ἀλάλαξον*), not found either in Matthew or the LXX. It proceeds, 'Shout, daughter of Jerusalem' (*κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ*), which agrees with the LXX, but is not found in Matthew. It proceeds, 'Behold, thy king' (lit. *the king*) (*Ἴδὸν ὁ βασιλεύς*), which agrees with both Matthew and the LXX. It proceeds, 'Of thee' (*σου*), found in Matthew, but not in

¹ In editing *Protevangeli-um*, Thilo did not attempt to discover which was the true text, but it must be noticed that, having regard to the antiquity of Justin, as likely a method as any to arrive at the original text would be to adopt throughout those readings which agree best with Justin. I may here state that the only editions of *Protevangeli-um* I have studied are those of Fabricius and Thilo, and my statements regarding it must be taken as limited to what appears in those editions.

the LXX. 'Will draw nigh' (ἥξει), which differs from both Matthew and the LXX, which have 'cometh' (ἔρχεται). It proceeds, 'to thee' (σοι), which agrees with both Matthew and the LXX. It proceeds, 'Just and a Saviour, he is meek' (δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς καὶ πραῦς). This agrees with the LXX, but differs from Matthew, which has merely the word *πραῦς*, meek. It proceeds, 'and poor' (καὶ πτωχός), which is not found either in Matthew or the LXX. It proceeds, 'riding upon' (ἐπιβεβηκώς ἐπὶ), differing from most texts of Matthew, and from the LXX only in the omission of the word *καὶ*, 'and,' before *ἐπιβεβηκώς*. *καὶ*, however, is also omitted in Matthew according to Codex D and some other authorities. It proceeds, 'a beast of burden and a foal of an ass' (ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον ὄνου), differing from the LXX, which says, 'a beast of burden and a young foal' (ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον); and from Matthew which says, 'an ass and a foal, the son of a beast of burden' (ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου; according to codex D, however, the last word should be *ὑποζύγιον*).

The differences from Matthew, which consist in adopting or approaching to the words of the LXX, might be accounted for by the process of assimilation, but not so the differences which are divergencies from the LXX, that is to say the insertion of *ἀλάλαξον*, 'Raise the war cry;' the substitution of *ἥξει* for *ἔρχεται*; and the insertion of the word *πτωχός*, poor. The language of this quotation therefore leads to the inference that it is not made from Matthew.

When the context is looked at, that would be consistent with the inference that the quotation comes from a gospel, and the substance of the narrative does

not differ materially from that of the synoptic gospels, or from what might have been derived from combining them.

Thus Justin agrees with Matthew as against Mark and Luke in the curious statement that Jesus entered Jerusalem riding upon both beasts, the colt and the ass; and gives a reason for it that the colt, unused to harness, was a symbol of the Gentile converts, and the ass, used to harness, of the Jews. When, however, the language of Justin is looked at closely, there are differences which suggest that he followed rather a common original of our synoptics, or some parallel narrative founded on such a common original, than those books themselves. Thus, instead of saying with Mark and Luke that the colt was one whereon no man ever yet sat (ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς οὐπω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν),¹ he twice describes it by the unusual, not to say barbarous word *ἀσαγής*, unused to harness, which he explains to mean not having a yoke on his neck. Then he says that Jesus bid his disciples bring him 'an ass tied with her colt at an entrance of a village called Bethphage' (ὄνον τινα σὺν πῶλῳ αὐτῆς προσδεδεμένην ἐν τινὶ εἰσόδῳ κώμης Βεθφαγῆς λεγομένης).² Now Matthew, which is the only one of the synoptic gospels which mentions the ass as distinguished from the colt, simply makes Jesus tell his disciples that they will find 'an ass tied and a colt with her' (ὄνον δεδεμένην καὶ πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς).³ Mark however, which only recognises the colt, says the disciples found a colt tied at the door without in the open street (πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς θυρὰν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου).⁴ Luke gives no

¹ Mark xi. 2, Luke xix. 30.

² *Ibid.* c. 53.

³ Matthew xxi. 2-3.

⁴ Mark xi. 4.

particulars. Now we see that Justin, while he agrees with Matthew in stating that there was an ass as well as a colt, states particulars which Matthew does not give, and even if we suppose he has applied to the ass what Mark says of the colt, the two statements are seen to be different. Justin says that the animal was tied at the entrance of the village, and Mark in the open street before the door.

Now when we consider that Justin must have studied the statements of his gospels minutely, with a view of showing the fulfilment of prophecies, it is very unlikely that he would get so far astray. The examination of the context, therefore, supports the conclusion, pointed at by the examination of the language of the quotation, that though the quotation is made from a gospel, that gospel is not Matthew.

To consider now the same passage as quoted in the 'Apology.'¹ As has been noticed, the language of that quotation differs from the LXX, from Matthew and from the 'Dialogue.' Where, however, it differs from Matthew it agrees with the LXX, and where it differs from the LXX it agrees with Matthew. It does not contain any of the words not found either in Matthew or the LXX, to be found in the 'Dialogue.' It agrees with the LXX in some points in which the quotation in the 'Dialogue' agrees with the LXX, and in which both differ from Matthew; on the other hand, it agrees with Matthew in some points in which Matthew differs from, and the 'Dialogue' agrees with the LXX.

¹ Χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών, κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ· Ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι πρῶτος, ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου. Justin, 1 *Ap.* cap. 35.

As to the source of the quotation, it may be at once concluded, notwithstanding the agreement of the latter part, that it does not come from Matthew. For it begins in the words of the LXX, 'Rejoice greatly, daughter of Zion, shout, daughter of Jerusalem,' instead of 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion,' as in Matthew (χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών, κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ, κ.τ.λ.), instead of Εἰπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών, ἰδοὺ, κ.τ.λ.). Now any one accustomed to read Matthew would be much more familiar with the quotation as given there than as standing in Zechariah, and, even if through quoting from memory he were to make some errors, would be certain to begin in the same way. On the other hand, that Justin did not on this occasion refer to Zechariah is shown by his wrongly referring the prophecy to Zephaniah. For the same reason the assumption would not be admissible that Justin originally gave the quotation as in Matthew, and that it has been since assimilated to the LXX. Transcribers of Justin from a few years after his own time have been all too familiar with the form the quotation takes in Matthew, to seek to change it, and any transcriber who corrected the language of the quotation would have also corrected the reference. On the other hand, the agreement of the latter part of the quotation with Matthew, which is exact with the exception of a single letter, which does not affect the sense (πρῶτος for πρᾶτος), and of the omission of καὶ before ἐπιβεβηκὼς, which agrees with Codex D and some other authorities, would seem to show that the quotation as given by Justin must have a common original with the quotation in Matthew.

The context does not give much aid in determin-

ing the source of this quotation. Some way back Justin had cited from Genesis xlix. 11, the text, 'Binding his foal to the vine,' &c., which he interpreted as a prophecy fulfilled by the disciples finding, as Jesus had told them, an ass's colt in the entrance of a certain village tied to a vine (ἐν τινὶ εἰσόδῳ κώμης πρὸς ἄμπελον δεδεμένος), riding on which Jesus entered Jerusalem.¹ It will be noticed that Justin here has the same difference from Mark in the description of the position of the colt, that he has in the 'Dialogue,' with the additional point of difference that it was tied to a vine. After this Justin quotes five, or more properly six, other Messianic prophecies including the words 'Behold the Virgin,' &c. And the words 'And thou, Bethlehem,' &c., we have already considered. Of these, the three or four that have not been already considered are quoted, with differences in words more or less considerable, from the LXX; some of the quotations also are abridged, in some the order of the words is altered, and in one place already cited some words out of Numbers together with others from Isaiah are run together and quoted as from Isaiah. None of these quotations, except the two already mentioned, are to be found in the canonical gospels. After this he quotes from Psalm xxii. in the words of the LXX, 'They pierced my feet and my hands and cast lots for my vesture.' He then proceeds as follows to explain the fulfilment of this and the preceding prophecies:—

'For, as said the prophet, mocking him they set him on a judgment seat and said, "Judge for us" (διασύροντες

¹ 1 Ap. c. 35.

αὐτὸν ἐκαθίσαν ἐπὶ βήματος καὶ εἶπον Κρίνον ἡμῶν).¹ But the prophecy "They pierced my hands and my feet" was a statement of the driving in of the nails into his hands and feet on the cross. And after crucifying him, those who crucified him cast lots for his vesture and divided it among them. And that these things happened you can learn from the "Acts in the time of Pontius Pilate." And to show that it was definitely prophesied that sitting on an ass's colt he should enter Jerusalem, we will repeat the words of the prophecy of another prophet Zephaniah. They are as follows: "Rejoice greatly," &c.'

After this Justin passes on to another topic. It will be seen that the context gives little aid in determining where the quotation comes from. Justin, having previously considered the entry into Jerusalem, abruptly returns to it when he has finished the topic on hand. The last book cited, the 'Acts in the time of Pilate,' cannot be identified with the extant work under that name, otherwise called the 'Gospel of Nicodemus.' It must be noticed that in the short passage out of Justin under consideration, two noteworthy statements have been encountered not in the canonical gospels, that the colt was tied to a vine, and the mocking words 'Judge for us.'

I will now again return to the quotation as it occurs in the 'Dialogue,' and see if any explanation can be given of its peculiar form. The peculiarity of this passage is that it contains words not found in the LXX, which appear to be alternative versions, or in other words part of the quotation is rendered into Greek twice over, once according to the LXX and once

¹ 1 Ap. c. 35. The newly discovered fragment of the gospel of Peter contains a similar statement. We may suppose therefore that that also is founded on the *Acts in the time of Pilate*.

otherwise. The only way that I can suggest to account for this is that the passage was originally an independent version from the Hebrew considerably abridged; that it was collated with the LXX by some one who wrote the renderings of the LXX in the margin, both where passages had been left out and where they had been translated differently; and that some transcriber carelessly incorporating these passages in the text, produced the effect I have noticed.

Restoring from the different quotations of the passage the points of difference from the LXX, we get the following as the original form of it: *Εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών, ἀλάλαξον, ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἥξει σοὶ πτωχὸς ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου.*

If this be compared with the LXX, which is as follows: *χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ Σιών, κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔρχεται σοὶ δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον*, it will be seen that not more than nine words agree, including *Σιών*, *ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς*, *σοὶ* and *καί*. It is therefore altogether an independent version. It will also be seen that the word *ἀλάλαξον*, which when added to *εἶπατε* may be rendered 'Say hurrah!' restores the meaning 'rejoice' which is altogether lost in Matthew.

The quotation standing as we have restored it, some one must have collated it with the LXX, and written the points of difference in the margin of the codex something in this way,

*Χαῖρε σφόδρα θύγατερ
κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἱερουσαλήμ
ἔρχεται*

*δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτὸς πραῦς καὶ
ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον.*

With the aid of the margin, at some subsequent date, the text of the quotation must have been reconstructed. But the reconstructor must not have quite known when he ought to insert the phrases in the margin and when to substitute them for the text: in this way he left standing *ἀλάλαξον* and *πτωχὸς*.

As express mention of the ass seemed to be required, he preserved it by substituting *ὄνον* for *νέον*; perhaps the original collator had omitted to insert *ἔρχεται* in the margin; perhaps the reconstructor of the text did not know where to place it. Whether this process was performed by Justin himself or by some writer from whom he copied the quotation cannot be in this case determined, though the way in which he differs from himself in making the quotation would be explicable by supposing that he made the reconstruction himself and made it differently on each occasion.¹

I will now pass on to consider the last quotation, that from Isaiah xlii. 1-4, quoted in Matthew xii. 17-21 and by Justin twice, 'Dialogue,' c. 123 and 135. Both quotations are made by Justin in order to show that God, speaking of Christ in the Old Testament, calls him Jacob and Israel. They differ somewhat in language; sometimes agreeing with the LXX, some-

¹ The latter part of the quotation is extant in all the *Hexapla* texts. Aquila gives it: *αὐτὸς πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱοῦ ὀνάδων*. Symmachus: *αὐτὸς πτωχὸς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὀνάδας*. Theodotion: *αὐτὸς ἐπαυῶν καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὄνου*. And the fifth version: *αὐτὸς πτωχὸς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὄνων*.

times with Matthew; and neither differing from the LXX in any material point in which Matthew does not also differ. Both quotations begin in the words of the LXX, 'Jacob is my servant, I will help him; Israel is my chosen,' instead of, as with Matthew, 'Behold my servant whom I have chosen.'¹ The purpose of the quotations required the mention of the names Jacob and Israel, which are not contained in Matthew, or, as I judge by the Authorised Version, in Isaiah. From these facts it may be inferred (1) that Justin did not quote from Matthew; (2) that he did not make an independent translation from the Hebrew.

His quotations must therefore be supposed to have arisen from his in some way mixing the text of the quotation adopted in Matthew with the LXX version. Now this is done by him in two places in the 'Dialogue' in different ways, and the only supposition I can make to account for it is this: That he used some MS. containing Messianic prophecies translated independently from the Hebrew, which he or some one else had collated with the LXX, writing the differences in the margin, and that then as he made his quotations he constructed his text from these two sources as he went on, sometimes taking more from one source and sometimes from the other, thus bringing it about that the one quotation agrees more closely with Matthew, and the other with the LXX. This theory would, I think, explain most of the difficulties with regard to Justin's Messianic quotations. It is, however, probable that in some cases they came from evangelical works, but that even in

¹ For the different quotations of this passage in Justin and Matthew, and also the LXX version of it, see Appendix iv.

such cases he may have more or less assimilated them to the LXX in the way I have stated.

NOTE.—Some interesting remarks upon the text of Justin Martyr by the late Dr. Hatch are to be found in his 'Essays in Biblical Greek,' p. 186 *et seq.* It appears that Justin's text rests practically upon one MS. only, known as Cod. Paris 450, dated 1364, that the texts of other works contained in that MS. which can be tested by comparing them with better authorities are not good, and internal evidence is adduced to show 'that the scribe of the MS. or its original neglected Justin's own quotations and copied them for himself from some other MS.' After citing some cases of assimilation, not including that I have given above, Dr. Hatch draws the following conclusions:—

'It is clear from these instances that the longer quotations in the Paris MS. of Justin cannot be trusted as representations of Justin's own text, and that arguments based upon them alone fall to the ground. But it is also clear that the untrustworthiness of the longer quotations does not affect the shorter quotations which form an integral part of Justin's own text, and which are in many cases confirmed by his comments.'

These conclusions of Dr. Hatch I should be disposed to accept with a certain qualification. The changes which have been made in the MS. of Justin, so far as ascertainable, have been with the view of bringing him into conformity with standard authorities. Anything, therefore, in Justin which tends to confirm opinions current in the church ought to be accepted with caution, especially if it turns upon a word or two which might have been changed or interpolated. But arguments which turn upon differences from

standard authorities are not in any way vitiated by a consideration of the treatment to which the MS. of Justin appears to have been subjected. Where mixed quotations occur, the likeness of the separate parts to canonical authorities may be the work of a transcriber, but scarcely the mixture or dislocation of the texts. So a transcriber might produce mixed renderings by a partial assimilation, but a transcriber who copied out of another book, as described by Dr. Hatch, would rather produce a complete agreement with some one generally accepted text. Besides, for a mixed rendering to have been produced in this way, the quotation as it stood in the original text of Justin must have differed from any canonical authority; otherwise there would have been no motive to tamper with it.

CHAPTER X

SOURCE OF SOME MESSIANIC PROPHECIES IN
JUSTIN MARTYR, NOT FOUND IN MATTHEW

THE Messianic prophecies quoted in Justin which I have hitherto dealt with are those also found in Matthew. I will now notice some not found in the canonical gospels, and I will first deal with the curious quotation which I have already noticed for another purpose, and which is contained in the passage immediately preceding the passage which contains the quotation from Isaiah vii. 14, also found in Matthew i. 2-3, 'Behold the Virgin,' &c. It is as follows:—

'And Isaiah also, another prophet, prophesying the same things in other words, thus said: "A star shall arise out of Jacob and a flower shall go up from the root of Jesse, and in his arm shall the Gentiles hope" (*Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἄθος ἀναβήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς ῥίζης Ἰεσοῦ, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιδύσουσι*).'¹

As I have said, this quotation is not a little curious. Justin quotes the whole as from Isaiah, but the first four words, 'A star shall arise out of Jacob' (*Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ*), really come out of the book of Numbers, where they are put into the mouth of Balaam, and are to be found word for word in the LXX. (See

¹ 1 Ap. c. 32.

Numbers xxiv. 17.) The remaining words come, some from the first verse and the others from the tenth verse of the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, and are all to be found in the LXX, except that it has ἐπ' αὐτῷ, 'in him,' instead of ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα αὐτοῦ, 'in his arm.' Justin quotes the passage from Numbers xxiv. 17, in chapter 106 of his 'Dialogue with Trypho,' a little more fully. 'A star shall rise out of Jacob, and a leader out of Israel' (Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ), and here refers it to Moses. The additional words added in this place (καὶ ἡγούμενος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ) differ from the LXX, which has 'A man shall stand up out of Israel' (ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ).¹

The same passage, Numbers xxiv. 17, is quoted by Irenaeus in his third book against heresies, chapter ix. 2, apparently, as near as we can judge by the Latin version, with one exception, in the words used by Justin in the 'Dialogue.' The quotation runs thus:— 'oriatur stella ex Jacob et surget dux in Israel,' where the word 'dux' (leader) is evidently a translation of the ἡγούμενος found in Justin, and not the ἄνθρωπος of the LXX. In the ordinary text of Irenaeus the quotation is put into the mouth of Balaam, but according to the Vossian codex Irenaeus makes the same blunder as is done by Justin in the 'Apology,' and attributes the quotation to Isaiah.² Now from these facts we may draw the following inferences. In the

¹ The Alexandrine codex has καὶ before ἀναστήσεται.

² See Stieren's edit. vol. i. p. 453. Stieren brands this reading as 'perperam,' but he describes the Vossian codex which contains it as 'optimis MSS. adnumerandum esse,' and gives reasons which show that it was copied from a very ancient exemplar, in which Greek passages were written in uncial letters. See *Prolegomena*, xx. xxiii.

first place, there can be no doubt the reading of the Vossian codex exhibits the true text of Irenaeus. No reason can be supposed why any transcriber of Irenaeus who found Balaam, should erroneously substitute Isaiah, and at the same time stumble into an agreement with Justin in such an obvious blunder. On the other hand, it is not at all surprising that such a blunder as the reference to Isaiah should be corrected. Secondly, the agreement of Irenaeus with Justin in the erroneous reference to Isaiah, and also in the use of the word 'leader' (ἡγούμενος or dux) not found in the LXX, shows that Irenaeus either quotes from Justin or from some source, not the LXX, which Justin also followed. Thirdly, Irenaeus cannot have quoted from the 'Apology,' because he would not there get the word ἡγούμενος, and would probably have taken some of the words found in that quotation which in fact come from Isaiah. Fourthly, Irenaeus cannot have quoted from the 'Dialogue' as we have it, because there he would have found the quotation with a reasonable degree of correctness referred to Moses instead of to Isaiah.

We are therefore driven to the conclusion that Irenaeus quoted from some source other than the LXX, from which Justin also quoted.

This conclusion is fortified by the consideration of the difference between the quotation in Justin and the quotation in Irenaeus. Justin uses only one verb, 'A star shall arise (ἀνατελεῖ) out of Jacob, and a leader out of Israel.' Irenaeus uses another verb in the second clause, 'A star shall arise (oriatur) out of Jacob and a leader shall stand up (surget) in Israel.' Now as a fresh verb is used in the second clause in the LXX, in the Vulgate, and in the English versions,

it may be safely considered that this is the more natural way of rendering the original. But the passage as it stands in Justin does not halt in any way for want of a second verb. Supposing therefore Irenaeus had taken his quotation from this source, he would have had no inducement to supply it. On the other hand, nothing is more probable than that Justin might omit the second verb as superfluous or by accident.

The only escape from this conclusion possible would be by supposing that Justin originally referred the quotation in the 'Dialogue' to Isaiah; that this was copied by Irenaeus; and that the reference in Justin was afterwards corrected by his transcribers. But this theory does not account for the use of the second verb by Irenaeus and not by Justin. Moreover, upon it Justin would on two distinct occasions make the same gross blunder in the reference, a thing in itself improbable, unless there was some cause for it; and such a cause could only be the existence of the misreference in some work he followed, for in the 'Dialogue' he cannot have copied from himself in the 'Apology,' as the 'Dialogue' contains words not found either in the LXX or in the 'Apology.' We should therefore equally on this hypothesis establish the existence of some work on Messianic prophecy used by Justin, in which the prophecies were given in a version other than the LXX.

There is, however, still the possibility that this work might have consisted of notes compiled by Justin himself. This however is improbable. Had Justin laboriously extracted the prophecies from the Hebrew text and translated them into Greek, he would probably have remembered where they came from.

Again there remains to consider the verbal agreement the quotations have in part with the LXX. This I explain, as I have done before, by the hypothesis that the work on Messianic prophecy used by Justin had been collated with the LXX and the renderings of the LXX written in the margin, and that these marginal readings, so far as they could be conveniently identified, were substituted by Justin for the original text.¹

I will now pass on to another quotation made by Justin. In his 'First Apology,' cap. 35, he says thus:—

'And that the Christ when born would be concealed from the rest of mankind until he became a man, which actually happened, hear the things foretold on this point. They are as follows: "A child was born to us, and a young man was restored to us, whose dominion is upon his shoulders" (*Παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν, καὶ νεανίσκος ἡμῖν ἀπεδόθη, οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων*),² disclosing the power of the cross to which he applied his shoulders when crucified, as will appear more clearly as my discourse proceeds.'

The prophecy cited by Justin is from Isaiah ix. 6, and according to the LXX runs thus, "*Ὅτι παιδίον ἐγεννήθη ἡμῖν υἱὸς καὶ ἐδόθη ἡμῖν οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὤμου αὐτοῦ*." 'For a child was born to us, a son also was given to us whose dominion was upon his shoulder.'

It will be noticed that Justin differs from the LXX in using the words, 'And a young man was restored to us,' instead of the words, 'A son also was given

¹ The only one of the *Hecrapla* texts of the passage in question which has been preserved is that of Symmachus, which, instead of the *ἄνθρωπος* of the LXX, and the *ἰγούμενος* of Justin and Irenaeus, reads *οκλήπτρον*.

² 1 Ap. 35.

to us,' and also of the word 'shoulders' in the plural, instead of 'shoulder' in the singular. It will be further noticed that, as rendered by Justin, the passage may with some difficulty be construed as he would have it, into a prophecy that the Messiah should be unknown until he was a grown man, with an obscure reference to his crucifixion, but that this would be impossible if the rendering of the LXX be adopted. The passage may therefore be safely taken as an independent translation from the Hebrew, not as an inaccurate quotation from the LXX. Its partial agreement with the LXX is capable of explanation either by assuming that the translator made use of that version as far as it served his purpose, or by supposing that the passage was afterwards collated with the LXX, and assimilated to it so far as could be done without destroying the interpretation put upon it.¹

The passage we have just quoted follows in the 'Apology' immediately after the passage in which 'Thou, Bethlehem,' &c., is quoted from Micah.

The next quotation I will consider is of a prophecy which, though perhaps not strictly Messianic, is on a topic, the destruction of Jerusalem, which, when viewed as a consequence of the rejection by the Jews of the Messiah, is so closely related that it might be well included in any work on Messianic prophecies. Justin writes thus:—

'Also concerning its desolation and concerning the fact that none of them would be permitted to dwell there, it has been said thus by Isaiah the prophet, "Their land is desolate, in their presence their enemies devour it, and

¹ This passage is preserved according to the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, but none of them agree with Justin in any of the points in which he differs from the LXX.

there shall be none of them who dwells in it" ('Η γῆ αὐτῶν ἔρημος, ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν αὐτὴν φάγονται, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ).'¹

This prophecy, though referred by Justin to Isaiah, is really a combination of texts taken from Isaiah i. 7 and Jeremiah l. 3 (xxvii. according to the arrangement of the LXX); the language differs considerably from the LXX, according to which the portion quoted of Isaiah i. 7, that is, all the words in the quotation down to *φάγονται*, runs thus:—'*Ἡ γῆ ὑμῶν ἔρημος, αἱ πόλεις ὑμῶν πυρίκαυστοι, τὴν χώραν ὑμῶν ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀλλότριοι κατεσθίουσιν αὐτήν.*'² 'Your land is desolate, your cities burned with fire, your country before your face strangers eat it up,' while the portion which comes from Jeremiah l. 3, that is, the remainder of the quotation, runs thus:—*καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἕως κτήνους.*'² 'And there shall be none who dwells in it, from a man even to a beast.'

It will be noticed that in that part of the prophecy which comes from Isaiah, the sense is not materially different from that of the LXX, though there is a great difference in language. In the part which comes from Jeremiah, with the exception of the insertion of the words *ἐξ αὐτῶν*, the language of Justin, as far as it goes, is identical with the LXX. The insertion of these words, however, coupled with the omission to quote the words which follow, and also, perhaps I should say, of the preceding words, makes a great change in the meaning. Jeremiah intended to prophesy of Babylon that it should be uninhabited by

¹ 1 Ap. c. 47.

² The Alexandrine codex omits *καὶ* between *ἀνθρώπου* and *ἕως*.

man or beast. Supposing this prophecy to be applied to Jerusalem by the process of taking words out of their proper meaning, so customary with interpreters of prophecy, there still remains the difficulty that at the time Justin wrote the city of Aelia Capitolina was standing or in process of erection upon the site of Jerusalem. If, therefore, the words of Jeremiah had been quoted exactly, even after surmounting the difficulty that he was speaking of Babylon, not Jerusalem, their fulfilment in the sense in which they are applied by Justin would not be at all apparent.

Now it is very hard to suppose that Justin intentionally falsified this prophecy. The facts of the case appear to be best met by supposing that he made use of a catena of extracts originally made from the Hebrew, translated into Greek, and afterwards collated with the LXX more or less perfectly, and the words of the LXX written more or less perfectly in the margin. In such a case the mixture of the words of the LXX with an independent version, and the running together of quotations from different prophets would be easy of explanation. So would the alteration made by Justin in the sense of the passage. At the time the catena was formed Jerusalem probably had not been rebuilt after its destruction by Titus, and the framer of the catena might omit the words 'They are fled; they are gone both man and beast' as immaterial. The question of their materiality would not be considered by the collator, and Justin, having before him only the words *καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ*, would readily insert *ἐξ αὐτῶν* to bring out more clearly what he did not doubt was the sense. It must be noticed that no dogmatic reason can be given for the varia-

tion from the language of the LXX in the part of the prophecy that comes from Isaiah.

The confusion together of extracts from Isaiah and Jeremiah should also be compared with the similar confusion of extracts from different places in Isaiah and from Numbers and Isaiah we were just considering, and also the similar confusion between Malachi and Isaiah in Mark i. 2; also the reference by Justin of a prophecy to Zephaniah instead of Zechariah, also the similar reference in Matthew (xxvii. 9) of a prophecy to Jeremiah instead of Zechariah. All these mistakes are of a class incident to the use of a catena of extracts in which extracts from one author get readily mixed with extracts from another, and entire extracts get referred to the wrong author. They therefore point to the existence of such a catena which was used by Justin and Irenæus as well as by the authors of Matthew and Mark, or rather, I should say, of the work whence was derived the matter common to the three synoptic gospels.

Justin again quotes Isaiah i. 7 in his 'Dialogue with Trypho':—

'For the circumcision according to the flesh, which is from Abraham, was given for a sign, that you might be distinguished from other nations and us, and that the things which now in justice you suffer you might suffer alone, and that your countries might become desolate, and the cities burned with fire, and the crops strangers might eat up before your face, and none of you should go up into Jerusalem (*ἵνα γένωνται αἱ χώραι ὑμῶν ἔρημοι, καὶ αἱ πόλεις πυρίκαυστοι, καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν κατεσθίωσιν ἄλλότριοι, καὶ μηδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐπεβαίῃ ἐῖς τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ*).'¹

¹ *Dial.* c. 16.

Notwithstanding the indirect nature of this quotation, it will be found to follow the LXX much more closely than the direct quotation in the 'Apology,' the only difference being the substitution of *τοὺς κυρποὺς* for *τὴν χώραν* and the transposition of the latter word into the first clause and its substitution there for *γῆ*, also the omission of *ὑμῶν* after *πόλεις*. These changes, coupled with the indirect form of the quotation, are sufficient to show that Justin was quoting from memory and not with the book before him; and therefore that the words which ran in his head were those of the LXX, not those which he used when quoting directly in the 'Apology.' It will be further noticed that the sense of the latter part of the prophecy quoted in the 'Apology,' that which comes from Jeremiah, ran in Justin's head also when writing the 'Dialogue,' but not the words. He expresses it in altogether different language: 'And none of you should go up into Jerusalem' (*καὶ μηδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐπιβυίῃ εἰς τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ*). These considerations tend to support the conclusion that when Justin was quoting directly in the 'Apology' he was not quoting from memory, and that therefore he made use of some document which contained a version of the passage independent of the LXX.

Immediately after the passage we have just been considering Justin introduces another prophecy as follows:—

'Also that it was foretold that our Christ would heal all diseases and raise (*ἀνγερεῖν*) the dead, hear what has been said. It is as follows: "At his coming will a lame man leap as a hart, and plain will be the tongue of the stammerers, the blind will receive their sight, the lepers will be cleansed, and the dead will rise up and walk" (Τῇ

παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλείται χωλὸς ὡς ἔλαφος καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάων, τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσι καὶ λεπροὶ καθαρσθήσονται, καὶ νεκροὶ ἀναστήσονται καὶ περιπατήσουσιν); and that he did these things you can learn from the "Acts in the time of Pontius Pilate" (*ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου γενομένων ἁγίων*).¹

In his 'Treatise on the Resurrection,' Justin again makes the same quotation in somewhat different language.²

'For did they not see on the earth the blind receiving their sight and the lame walking (*τυφλοὺς ἀναβλέποντας, χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας*) at his word? All which things the Saviour did: firstly indeed that it might be fulfilled which was said by the prophets about him that "The blind receive their sight and the deaf hear &c.," (*τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσι καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα*), but also that we may have faith that in the resurrection the flesh will be raised whole.'

The passage supposed to be quoted in both places is Isaiah xxxv. 5, according to the LXX: *Τότε ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν καὶ ὠτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται. Τότε ἀλείται ὡς ἔλαφος ὁ χωλός, τρανὴ δὲ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάων*. 'Then will the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf will hear. Then will the lame man leap as an hart, and plain will be the tongue of the stammerers.' If we compare this with Justin, we see that, instead of 'Then will the eyes of the blind be opened' (*Τότε ἀνοιχθήσονται ὀφθαλμοὶ τυφλῶν*), he has 'The blind will receive their sight' (*Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσι*), evidently an altogether different version. In the 'Apology' the words 'And the ears of the deaf will hear' are left out; but in the 'Discourse on the Resurrection' he has 'The deaf hear' (*κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν*); again

¹ 1 Ap. c. 48.

² C. 4.

a version different from the LXX, 'The ears of the deaf will hear' (ὅτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται).

The words 'Then will the lame man leap as a hart and plain will be the tongue of the stammerers' he has in the 'Apology' word for word with the LXX; but in the 'Discourse on the Resurrection' another rendering of these words also is disclosed in the words *χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας*, which would be *χωλοὶ περιπατήσουσιν*, 'the lame will walk.' We must suppose, therefore, that an attempt was made in the 'Apology' to substitute the words of the LXX for these words; but that in so doing the word *περιπατήσουσιν* was left in by mistake, and so found a nominative in *νεκροὶ*, so making the dead to walk as well as rise.

There remains to consider the words 'And lepers will be cleansed and the dead will rise.' There is nothing in the passage in Isaiah of which these words can be a rendering or a paraphrase. They are therefore probably words from some other place which have been run together, as we have already had occasion to notice in previous cases. This is rendered the more probable as in the 'Discourse on the Resurrection' the citation is made from the prophets. What places they are supposed to come from is more difficult to say. In Leviticus xiv. 2-9 we read: 'This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing . . . he shall be clean;' and in Psalm lxxxviii. 10: 'Shall the dead arise?' Free renderings of these passages might produce the words cited by Justin. If it be objected that this is simply to find the quotations *totidem verbis*, it may be answered that other prophecies, probably from the same collection, are no better. For instance, 'That it might be fulfilled which

was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene,' for which no better original can be found than the statement of the angel to the wife of Manoa, as to the future Samson: 'For the child shall be called a Nazarite unto God from the womb.'

The explanation of the foregoing phenomena is the same as that we have had suggested before. Justin used a catena of quotations, originally made in Hebrew, translated into Greek and afterwards collated with the LXX, and the LXX renderings written in the margin. Justin's quotations were produced by mixing the renderings of the LXX with those of the original document, and also by running consecutive quotations from different books together as if they were continuous. That the mixture was made by Justin himself is shown by the components being found to vary in different quotations of the same passage. In this case by comparing the quotation in the 'Apology' with that in the 'Discourse on the Resurrection' we can restore the passage as it stood in the text of the catena used by Justin without much doubt. It must have been as follows: *Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσιν καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούσονται, καὶ λεπροὶ καθαρισθήσονται, καὶ νεκροὶ ἀναστήσονται, καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατήσουσιν.* 'The blind will receive their sight and the deaf will hear, and the lepers will be cleansed, and the dead will rise up, and the lame will walk.' It will be noticed the quotation was so familiar that Justin winds it up in the 'Discourse of the Resurrection' with an &c. (*καὶ τὰ ἄλλα*).

Before leaving this passage we must not fail to compare it with the answer said to have been given by Jesus to John's disciples, which is found in almost the same words in Matthew and Luke:—

'Go your way, tell John the things which ye do hear and see, the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them (Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται).'¹

It must be noticed that this must be taken to be an answer in the affirmative to John's question whether Jesus was the Messiah. It can only be such an answer on the supposition of a well-known prophecy, of which these words stated the fulfilment; and this prophecy we see to be the same as that which was in the hands of Justin. The only difference, apart from a slight difference in order²—which may perhaps be owing to an error in my restoration of the prophecy that was before Justin—being the substitution of *ἐγείρονται* for *ἀναστήσονται*, or rather, as it would be the present and not the future, *ἀνίστανται*; and the addition of the words 'the poor have the good tidings preached to them.'

Possibly these differences ought to be reduced, as the passage in Matthew is quoted by Clement of Alexandria and Origen with the reading *ἀνίστανται* instead of *ἐγείρονται*.

But apart from this latter possibility the agreement between the prophecy implied in the words of Matthew and Luke (and which, therefore, we may suppose was in the hands of the writers of those books—or perhaps, rather, of some book, portions of which are embodied in both their narratives) and the

¹ Matthew xi. 5, Luke vii. 22.

² The words which are differently placed (*χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν*) are omitted altogether in Codex D.

prophecy in the hands of Justin, is so close and remarkable as to leave no doubt of their derivation from a common written source—and that source must have contained a rendering independent altogether of the LXX. Moreover, the agreement is not merely in the rendering, but in the running together of quotations from different places, so as apparently to form one prophecy, some of which are only to be found in the Old Testament at all by great straining of the words as well as the meaning. We see, therefore, the common source must have been a catena of extracts, and this is confirmed by the fact that Matthew and Luke follow the catena one step further by the addition of the words 'And the poor have good tidings preached to them' (*καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται*), which appear to refer to Isaiah lxi. 1, 'The spirit of the Lord God is upon me because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the poor.' According to the LXX: Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμὲ οὐ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέ με εὐαγγελίσεσθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέ με. Having regard to the nature of the reference, the words of Matthew perhaps in this last case follow the LXX as closely as might be expected if we supposed that to be the source from which the part of the prophecy relating the evangelisation of the poor came. But there is nothing in this to shake the inferences drawn from the former part of the passage. The same two words used in the LXX, *πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται*, may have been used by the original translator, or they may have become assimilated to the LXX at some subsequent stage.

The only possible escape from the foregoing conclusion would be to argue that Justin constructed his

prophecy after the model of the prophecy implied in Matthew and Luke. To this there are insuperable objections. Such a process must have been intentional on the part of Justin. Now in no one place in his writings is to be found the prophecy implied in Matthew and Luke. We only arrive at the conclusion that he had such a prophecy before him by piecing together what he says on two different occasions. The supposition, therefore, of his having intended to construct the prophecy to supply the place of that implied in Matthew or Luke, falls to the ground. Had he done so he would have stated it explicitly.

Moreover (according to the more probable reading in the 'Apology') Justin expressly refers to the 'Acts in the time of Pilate' as the source of his information as to the fulfilment of the prophecy.

Before leaving this passage we must not omit to notice its bearing upon another question noticed above: that is, whether the passages from the Old Testament, cited as having been fulfilled in Jesus, were in the material common to the three synoptics and left out by Mark and Luke, or whether they were absent from the common material and were inserted by Matthew.

We have already found an argument from comparison with Matthew and Mark in favour of the former contention. The passage now before us affords an argument bearing in a similar direction—that is, it shows that a writer of material common to Matthew and Luke had before him a work containing prophecies originally extracted from the Hebrew.

To pass on to another quotation, in the 'First Apology,' cap. 51, we read:—

'But that he was to ascend into heaven as it was foretold, hear. For it was spoken thus: "Lift the gates of the heavens. Be ye opened, that the King of Glory may come in! Who is this King of Glory? the strong Lord and the mighty Lord" (*Ἀρατε πύλας οὐρανῶν, ἀνοίχθητε ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης. Τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης; Κύριος κραταιὸς καὶ κύριος δυνατός*).

The passage here cited comes from Psalm xxiv. 7, 8. According to the LXX it runs thus:—

Ἀρατε πύλας οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπύρθητε πύλαι αἰώνιοι, καὶ εἰσέλθεται ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης. Τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης; Κύριος κραταιὸς καὶ δυνατός, Κύριος δυνατὸς ἐν πολέμῳ.

'Lift your gates, ye princes and be ye lift up ye everlasting gates, and the King of Glory will come in! Who is this King of Glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle.'

It will be noticed that this quotation differs from the LXX down to the words *ὁ βασιλεὺς* where they first occur. After this it agrees with the LXX verbatim, with the exception of the omission of the word *δυνατός* where it first occurs and of the words *ἐν πολέμῳ*.

The passage would appear to be the result of the mixture of an independent version with the LXX, as in previous cases. It cannot be a case of careless citation, as the LXX would not bear the meaning Justin puts upon it.¹

Immediately following the passage quoted above Justin proceeds: 'But that also he is about to come

¹ A portion of this passage has been preserved in two of the *Hexapla* texts. Aquila reads: *Ἀρατε πύλαι κεφαλᾶς ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπύρθητε ἀνοίγματα αἰώνια*; and Symmachus reads: *Μετάβατε πύλας οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν ὑψωθήτωσαν δὲ αἱ πύλαι αἰώνιοι*. It is obvious that the differences of Justin from the LXX are not in any way due to the influence of either of these versions.

with glory out of the heavens, hear also what has been said upon this point by Jeremiah the prophet. It is as follows: "Behold, as a son of man one comes above the clouds of heaven and his angels with him: 'Ἰδοὺ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ σὺν αὐτῷ.'"¹

The LXX version of this passage, which does not come from Jeremiah, but from Daniel vii. 13, is as follows: 'Ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἤρχετο καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρῆσαν αὐτῷ. 'Behold in the clouds of heaven one was coming as a son of man and one was present as ancient of days, and the attendants were present with him.'

Here again we see an independent version, influenced, probably, by the recollection of the language of the LXX rather than afterwards affected by mixture. It may be noticed that this direct quotation departs further from the language of the LXX than the allusion to the same passage in Matthew xxvi. 64 we have noticed above. 'Ἐπάνω is used instead of ἐπὶ, and the use of the present ἔρχεται for the imperfect, there being no change of construction to require it, constitutes a real difference, which the use of the participle in the allusion does not. I do not here notice the concluding words, as they do not occur at all in Matthew xxvi. 64. In the false reference to Jeremiah we again see the mark of the use of a catena of citations.

¹ 1 Ap. cap. 51. According to Theodotion, 'Ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος καὶ ἔως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔφθασε καὶ προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ. 'Behold with the clouds of heaven one coming as a son of man, and he came first to the ancient of days and approached him.' Justin both resembles and differs from this version about as much as he does from the LXX.

CHAPTER XI

CONCLUSIONS

I do not think it necessary to continue the examination of Justin's quotations from the Old Testament any further.

I have now examined eleven passages containing citations of sixteen passages from the Old Testament, fifteen of which differ more or less from the language of the LXX. Of these, five are also cited in Matthew, one in Irenaeus and one in Tertullian, and two are the subjects of an allusion in Matthew.

As regards the passages in which Justin agrees with Matthew and Irenaeus in words not found in the LXX, the fact that he is quoting from some written source, independent of the LXX, may be taken as established beyond doubt, and the same inference follows with but little doubt as regards the passage in which he agrees with Tertullian. The question then arises whether that source with regard to the quotations which partly agree with Matthew, can be Matthew. I think the examination I have made, both of the language of the quotations and of the context in which they occur, proves that this was not the case. But there still remains the question whether he was not quoting from some old evangelical work which

was made use of by the framers of our present texts of Matthew and 'Protevangelium.' I incline to the opinion that in some places this was the case, and of course it is possible that some of the quotations not found in Matthew come from such a source. But as regards the bulk of the quotations, there is nothing to indicate any such source. On the other hand there is much to show that they came from a catena of extracts originally made in Hebrew, then translated into Greek, and afterwards collated with the LXX, and the renderings of that version written in the margin; and that the citations in the gospels, as well as Justin, came originally from such a document. This is shown by the mixture of the renderings of the LXX with different renderings; by differences in the mixture in different quotations of the same passage; by the double renderings in the same quotation, once in the words of the LXX, and again in other words, *e.g.* *πρᾶος*, which can scarcely be said to differ from *πραῦς* and *πτωχός* in Zechariah ix. 9, by the way in which words which appear superfluous in Justin, added to words in Matthew, restore an otherwise lost sense; *e.g.* in the same quotation the apparently superfluous *ἀλάλαξον* added to the *εἶπατε* of Matthew gives the meaning 'Say hurrah!' which is equivalent to 'rejoice greatly,' the meaning of the original; also by the running together of quotations from different books and their reference to the wrong author. The extraordinary distortion of some of the quotations, so that it becomes impossible to do more than guess where they come from, again very much favours the theory that they were made in Hebrew by some one imperfectly acquainted with it, which I suppose would

be the case with many, even among the Palestine Jews.

On the whole, the examination of the quotations in Justin tends to show that such a book, as I have contended Papias attributed to Matthew, was in existence in the Primitive Church.

CHAPTER XII

MESSIANIC PROPHECIES NOT FOUND IN CANONICAL BOOKS

I WILL now pass on to consider some passages of another kind, that is to say, passages cited by Justin and some other fathers as quotations from canonical or apocryphal books of the Old Testament, but which are not now, and apparently never were, to be found in the books from which they are said to have been taken in any MS. or version. That these passages were not in the copies current in his day, Justin was aware, and he is prepared with an explanation. In the 'Dialogue with Trypho' (chap. lxxi.) he charges the Jews with having altogether taken away many passages from the translations made by the seventy elders with Ptolemy, and at the request of Trypho he gives some instances as follows (I quote from the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library') :—

'From the statements, then, which Esdras made in reference to the law of the passover, they have taken away the following : "And Esdras said to the people, This passover is our Saviour and our refuge. And if you have understood, and your heart has taken it in, that we shall humble Him on a standard, and thereafter hope in Him, then this place shall not be forsaken for ever, says the God of hosts. But if you will not believe Him, and will not

listen to his declaration, you shall be a laughing-stock to the nations" (Καὶ εἶπεν Ἐσδρας τῷ λαῷ· Τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐν διανοηθῆτε καὶ ἀναβῆ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν, ὅτι μέλλομεν αὐτὸν ταπεινοῦν ἐν σημείῳ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐλπίζοιμεν ἐπ' αὐτόν· οὐ μὴ ἐρημωθῇ ὁ τόπος οὗτος εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον, λέγει ὁ Θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων· ἔὰν δὲ μὴ πιστεύσητε αὐτῷ μηδὲ εἰσακούσητε τοῦ κηρύγματος αὐτοῦ, ἔσεσθε ἐπὶ χάρμα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). And from the sayings of Jeremiah they have cut out the following : "I (was) like a lamb that is brought to the slaughter : they devised a device against me, saying, Come, let us lay on wood on His bread, and let us blot Him out from the land of the living ; and His name shall be no more remembered." And since this passage is still written in some copies (of the scriptures) in the synagogues of the Jews (for it is only a short time since they were cut out), and since from these words it is demonstrated that the Jews deliberated about the Christ Himself, to crucify and put Him to death, He Himself is both declared to be led as a sheep to the slaughter, as was predicted by Isaiah, and is here represented as a harmless lamb ; but being in difficulty about them, they give themselves over to blasphemy. And again, from the sayings of the same Jeremiah these have been cut out : "The Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel who lay in the graves ; and He descended to preach to them his own salvation" (Ἐμνήσθη δὲ κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ τῶν νεκρῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν κεκοιμημένων εἰς γῆν χύματος, καὶ κατέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀναγγελλάμεσθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ) ; and from the ninety-fifth Psalm they have taken away this short saying of the words of David, "from the wood." For where the passage said, "Tell ye among the nations the Lord hath reigned from the wood" (Εἰπατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν· Ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου), they have left, "Tell ye among the nations the Lord hath reigned" (Εἰπατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν· Ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν).

The first passage, said to have been removed from Jeremiah, is Jeremiah xi. 19, and is found in all the

manuscripts. It is quoted sufficiently accurately from the LXX, with the exception of the omission of the word *ἄκακον*, harmless, qualifying the word lamb. With the other passages the case is different; the passages supposed to have been excised from Esdras and Jeremiah are not contained in any MSS. whatever, and the words supposed to have been excised from the psalm out of the great multitude of MSS. of the LXX are to be found in two only, where their presence is of little weight, the Verona Psalter and Cod. 156,¹ and as the Jews could not have brought it to pass that these passages should be excised from the copies in use among the Christians, we cannot suppose that such passages ever in fact formed part of the texts of Esdras, Jeremiah, or the Psalms. Justin, however, was not alone in citing these passages as from Esdras, Jeremiah, and the Psalms. The same passage is cited from Esdras by Lactantius, 'Instit. Div.' c. 18, in the following words:—'Apud Esdram ita scriptum est: Et dixit Esdras ad populum: Hoc pascha salvator noster est et refugium nostrum. Cogitate et ascendat in cor vestrum quoniam habemus humiliare eum in signo (or ligno); et post haec sperabimus in eum, ne deseratur hic locus in aeternum tempus, dicit dominus Deus virtutum. Si non credideritis ei neque exaudieritis adnuntiationem ejus, eritis derisio in gentibus.' As Otto remarks, this passage is cited by Lactantius 'non sine aliqua discrepantia.' The imperative 'cogitate' is substituted for 'Εάν διανοηθῇτε, and the assertion 'sperabimus' for the hypothesis 'Εάν . . . ἐλπίσωμεν, the clause 'ne deseratur, etc.' is made to depend on 'sperabimus,' and 'dominus' is inserted

¹ Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 189.

before 'Deus,' which has nothing to correspond to it in the Greek of Justin. The first difference is somewhat emphasised by the fact that 'Εάν διανοηθῇτε introduces one branch of an alternative, and the following words, 'Εάν δὲ μὴ πιστεύσητε, introduce another; and in the second case 'Εάν is naturally translated by 'si,' and the subjunctive is not turned into an imperative, which leads us to suppose that had Lactantius been translating from Justin, and had 'Εάν before him in the first place, he would have translated it in the same way.

Of themselves no great weight can be attached to these discrepancies, but the fact that Lactantius cites the passage as an existing passage from Esdras without calling attention to its having been excised from the book, is a strong argument that he got it from some source where its excision was not mentioned, and therefore not from Justin, and these discrepancies add weight to that argument. Besides this, Lactantius cites the passage in Latin. Immediately before, he cites three passages from the Sibyl in Greek. It would, therefore, appear probable that if he took this passage from Justin, he would cite it in Greek also.

It should be noticed, however, that Lactantius cites passages from the Old Testament in Latin, and it may be, therefore, that he dealt with the supposed passage from Esdras as with other passages from the Old Testament; but the probable reason of his citing the Old Testament in Latin is that he cites it from a Latin version, so that if the same reason applied to the supposed passage from Esdras, we must suppose that his version contained it, and therefore that he did not cite it from Justin; but a little further on he

cites another passage as from the Old Testament, which is not there. In the words addressed by the Lord to Solomon in 2 Chronicles vii., the answer to the question 'Why hath the Lord done thus unto this land and to this house?' is made to run: 'Because they left the Lord their God, and persecuted their king most beloved by God and crucified him in great humility, on account of these things God hath brought upon them these evils (*et persecuti sunt regem suum dilectissimum Deo et cruciaverunt illum in humilitate magnâ, propter hæc importavit illis Deus mala hæc*). It is altogether unknown where these words come from. It follows, therefore, that Lactantius had before him some book then extant in Latin, containing Messianic prophecies, some of which were fictitious, or at all events in which disconnected passages had got run together. We may therefore well suppose that the reputed passage from Esdras came from this source. We therefore trace up this passage as probably coming from some book containing other prophecies of the like nature.

The second passage, stated by Justin to have been excised from Jeremiah, is worthy of more note. It is cited or alluded to by Irenæus in no less than five different places. In the first place (lib. iii. c. xx. 4) he cites it as from Isaiah. In the second place (lib. iv. c. xxi. 1) he cites it as from Jeremiah. In the third place (lib. iv. c. xxxiii. 1) he sets it out among other prophecies fulfilled in the first advent of Christ. In the fourth place (lib. iv. c. xxxiii. 12) he sets it out among things spoken by other prophets; and in the fifth place (lib. v. cap. xxxi. 1) he sets it out as spoken

by the prophet. In none of these passages is the text of Irenæus extant in the Greek.

The first place is as follows:—

'Esaias ait: *Et commemoratus est Dominus sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum, qui dormierant in terra sepultionis; et descendit ad eos evangelizare salutem quæ est ab eo, ut salvaret eos.*'

The second place is as follows:—

'Sicut Hieremias ait: *Recommemoratus est Dominus sanctus Israel mortuorum suorum, qui prædormierunt in terra defossionis, et descendit ad eos, uti evangelizaret eis salutem suam, ad salvandum eos.*'

In the third place Irenæus says that the Jews are not willing to understand that all the prophets announced the two advents of Christ:—

'The one, indeed, in which he became a man, subject to stripes, and knowing what it is to bear infirmity, and sat upon the foal of an ass, and was a stone rejected by the builders, and was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and by stretching forth his hands destroyed Amalek; while he gathered from the ends of the earth into his Father's fold the children who were scattered abroad, and remembered his own dead ones who had formerly fallen asleep, and came down to them that he might deliver them (*et commemoratus mortuorum suorum qui ante dormierant, et descendens ad eos, uti erueret eos et salvaret eos*), but the second in which he will come on the clouds,' &c.

The fourth place is as follows:—

'Alii (i.e. prophetae) dicentes: *Rememoratus est Dominus sanctus mortuorum suorum, qui prædormierunt in terra limi et descendit ad eos, uti erigeret, ad salvandum illos; causam reddiderunt, propter quam passus est hæc omnia.*'

In the fifth place Irenaeus is arguing against some heretics who denied the resurrection of the body, and maintained that immediately on their death they should pass above the heavens. He proceeds as follows :—

‘How can they be wondered at if again they know nothing as to the place of the resurrection? For they do not choose to understand that if these things are as they say, the Lord himself, in whom they profess to believe, did not rise again upon the third day; but, immediately upon his expiring on the cross, undoubtedly departed on high, leaving his body to the earth. But the case was that for three days he dwelt in the place where the dead were, as the prophet says concerning him :

‘Propheta ait de eo: Commemoratus est Dominus sanctorum mortuorum suorum, eorum qui ante dormierunt in terra sepelitionis, et descendit ad eos, extrahere eos et salvare eos.’

Many of the differences to be found in these five citations probably arise from the Latin translator of Irenaeus having given different translations in different places of the same Greek words. Thus, ‘commemoratus est,’ ‘recommemoratus est,’ and ‘rememoratus est,’ are no doubt all different renderings of *ἐμνήσθη*. So ‘sepultionis,’ ‘defossionis,’ ‘limi,’ and ‘sepelitionis’ are probably all different renderings of *χώματος*. So ‘evangelizare salutem quae est ab eo’ and ‘uti evangelizaret eis salutem suam’ are two different renderings of *ἀναγγελλίσασθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ*, but ‘uti erueret eos,’ ‘uti erigeret,’ and ‘extrahere eos’ appear to point to a different reading. Whether the differences between ‘dormierant’ and ‘praedormierunt’ or ‘ante dormierunt’ point to any difference in reading may be doubted.

I will now pass on to two points in which a differ-

ence of reading can clearly be seen through the Latin version; where Justin has *κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ*, Irenaeus has in two places ‘Dominus sanctus Israel,’ in a third ‘Dominus sanctus,’ and in a fourth ‘Dominus sanctorum’ (mortuorum, &c.). In the remaining place the form of the allusion, for it is not a direct quotation, required the suppression of the nominative. We see, therefore, that the word *ἅγιος* was certainly part of the text as known to Irenaeus, though there is room for dispute as to whether, as most probable, he had it in the nominative qualifying *κύριος*, or whether he had it in the genitive agreeing with *νεκρῶν*, or whether he had it both ways. It is equally clear that the words *ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ* were not part of the text as known to Irenaeus.

Another distinction between the text of Irenaeus and that of Justin is that Irenaeus continues the quotation further, and in this all the places in Irenaeus agree. Thus the words ‘ut salvaret eos,’ ‘ad salvandum eos,’ ‘et salvaret eos,’ ‘ad salvandum illos,’ ‘et salvare eos’ have nothing to answer to them in Justin. These two points of distinction show that Irenaeus did not obtain the quotation from Justin, but this conclusion is very much strengthened by the fact that Irenaeus does not once suggest that the passage has been suppressed, or indicate any doubt that it was extant in the Old Testament, which he would hardly have failed to do had Justin been the source of his information. This apocryphal quotation appears to have had no small influence among the primitive Christians. On it appears to have been founded the dogma of the Descent of Christ into Hell, anciently called the Harrowing of Hell, which we still read in the Apostles’ Creed, and which formed the basis of the apocryphal ‘Gospel of

Nicodemus.' The note of Feuardentius to the last quotation shows that this dogma in its expanded form was adopted by the Catholic Church.¹

'He teaches plainly that which the Catholic Church has firmly believed and universally handed down about the descent of Christ to hell, namely that his soul separated from his body, not by a certain operation only, but by its proper presence (as we say in the schools), penetrated the lower parts of the earth and arrived at the place where the spirits of the saints were held, and remained with them up to the moment of the resurrection, whence it led forth together with itself as many as were fitted and suitable for the kingdom of God. That this dogma has always been reckoned among those articles of faith about which it is wicked to doubt can easily be collected from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and the books of all the Fathers.'

There is an allusion to a similar incident in one only of the canonical books—the first epistle of Peter. There we read (iii. 18), 'Because Christ also suffered for sins once . . . being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison which aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing;' and again (iv. 6), 'For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.'

It will be noticed that there are points of difference as well as points of agreement between these

¹ Stieren's *Irenaeus*, ii. 1063. F. Franciscus Feuardentius, ordinis F. Minorum in s. facultate Parisiensi Doctor theologus, published his second edition of *Irenaeus* A.D. 1596, *ibid.* i. 29.

passages and the passage quoted by Justin and Irenaeus. In particular, the former passage in 1 Peter brings out the point that Christ visited the dead in the spirit at the time when his body was dead. This point, which is emphasised by Irenaeus, is hardly to be found in the passage which he cites in support of it. Yet Irenaeus does not strengthen his position by citing 1 Peter, though he was acquainted with that book. The reason probably is that the authority Irenaeus was following, from which he got the supposed quotation by Jeremiah or Isaiah, did not cite 1 Peter, and would therefore date from a time anterior to 1 Peter, or at which 1 Peter was not old enough to have had much influence in the Church.

Another point of difference consists in the specific reference in 1 Peter of Christ's visit to the persons who were disobedient in the days of Noah; a third point of difference consists in the absence in 1 Peter of any express reference to the dead saints. In fact in this point there is a marked contrast between the passage quoted by Justin and Irenaeus and 1 Peter. In the supposed quotation the object of the visit is the instruction of the dead saints, which is said to have been attained. In 1 Peter the object of the visit is rather that the dead may be judged upon the same basis as the living, having had the same opportunities.

These differences lead to the conclusion that 1 Peter does not allude to the supposed passage from Jeremiah or Isaiah, and that that passage is not founded on 1 Peter. But though this is so, there can be no doubt that the writer of 1 Peter alludes to some account with which he supposes his readers will be familiar.

This dogma of the harrowing of Hell was one which obtained in the Middle Ages extensive acceptance among the people.

Thus in the 'Miller's Tale,' when Nicholas asks the carpenter to swear secrecy, he answers—

Say what thou wilt I schal it never telle
To child ne wyf by him that harwed helle.

And it must be noticed, as appears from the name 'the harrowing of Hell,' the dogma which obtained circulation was founded upon the apocryphal passage cited from Isaiah or Jeremiah, and not from the first epistle of Peter.

It must be noticed that a comparison of the citations in Irenaeus and Lactantius with those in Justin Martyr justifies the inference, not merely that they were not derived directly from Justin Martyr, but that they were not so derived indirectly—that is to say that they were not transmitted to Irenaeus and Lactantius through any writer who took them from Justin Martyr. This appears from two reasons, one of which is common to Irenaeus and Lactantius, and the other applicable to Irenaeus only.

The reason common to both is this, that both Irenaeus and Lactantius cite the passages as if there was no doubt that they were to be found in the books from which they purport to be taken. Now it is scarcely possible that any one deriving his knowledge of the passages from Justin could venture to cite them in such a way. He would know, if he did so, that he might appear to his reader to be himself inventing the prophecies. If, therefore, he cited them

at all, he would repeat Justin's charge against the Jews of mutilating the Scriptures.

The reason applicable to Irenaeus only is that he continues the quotation further than Justin; his authority, therefore, cannot have taken from Justin what was not there. We see, therefore, that the common source of these apocryphal prophecies must have been a work existing before the time of Justin.

The Psalm from which Justin says the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου have been excised by the Jews, is found in the Old Testament in two places—once in the Psalter and once in 1 Chronicles xvi.; and the two recensions of it differ considerably. Justin cites the Psalm at length twice—once in '1 Apology' 41, where the quotation agrees very nearly with the Chronicles, and once in 'Trypho' 73, where the quotation, as we have it, agrees with the Psalter. In Justin's citation in the 'Apology,' the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, which he complains have been excised, are to be found, but in 'Trypho' the MS. of Justin does not contain them. The omission of these words in 'Trypho' is the more remarkable as the citation follows immediately the passage we have cited above in which Justin accuses the Jews of having excised them.

The quotation in the 'Apology,' though following generally the language of the Chronicles, has some curious differences. For instance, instead of 'The gods of the nations are idols' (εἰδωλα), according to the Chronicles, or 'The gods of the nations are demons' (δαιμόνια), according to the Psalter, he has 'The gods of the nations are images (or idols) of demons' (εἰδωλα δαιμονίων), and instead of 'strength and rejoicing are in his place' (ἐν τόπῳ αὐτοῦ), he has

'strength and rejoicing are in the place of his sanctuary' (ἐν τόπῳ ἁγιάσματος αὐτοῦ), which would seem to be conflated with the reading of the Psalter, 'Holiness and majesty are in his sanctuary' (ἐν τῷ ἁγιάσματι αὐτοῦ). Instead of 'Give to the Lord ye families of the nations (αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν), give to the Lord glory and strength,' it has 'Give to the Lord the father of the æons (or ages) (τῷ πατρὶ τῶν αἰώνων) glory.' Instead of 'Take gifts and offer them before his face' (λάβετε δῶρα καὶ ἐνέγκατε κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ), it has 'Take a thankoffering and enter before his face' (λάβετε χάριν καὶ εἰσέλθετε κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ). The quotation concludes with the words, 'Let them rejoice among the nations, the Lord reigned from the wood' (εὐφρανθήτωσαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου), instead of, as in the Chronicles, 'Let the heaven rejoice, and let the earth be glad, and let them say among the nations The Lord is reigning' (εὐφρανθήτω ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθω ἡ γῆ καὶ εἰπάτωσαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν Κύριος βασιλεύων).

Besides the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, which it is clear Justin considered part of the text, he repeats the reading εἰδῶλα δαιμονίων in 'Trypho,' c. 55, but in three short citations which come after the citation of the whole Psalm in 'Trypho' the words are as in the Psalter. So in 'Trypho,' c. 73, he quotes the words εἶπατε ἐν ἔθνεσιν, which are left out in the 'Apology,' but in that place he refers to the Psalm by its number in the Psalter, which he evidently follows. The reading εἰδῶλα δαιμονίων is found in two other places—in Irenæus iii. 6, and Clement of Alexandria, 'Protrept.' c. 4. The reading τῷ πατρὶ τῶν αἰώνων

is partially confirmed by codices B and S, which, instead of αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, read πατρὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν.¹

Reference to the passage supposed to have been excised from the Psalm is again to be found in other authorities. Thus Tertullian ('Adv. Jud.') says, 'Come now if you have read in the power of the prophet in the Psalms, the Lord reigned from the wood (*Domini regnavit a ligno*), I look to see what you understand, lest by chance you think some woodcutter king to be meant, and not Christ who reigned from there, death being overcome by his suffering on the cross.' Tertullian here can scarcely be copying Justin, else he would not talk in this way about persons reading in the Psalms what he would have learnt from Justin they would not find there, but other Latin fathers besides Tertullian cited these words as from the Psalms, and they even found their way into the old Latin version; indeed, it has been suggested that it is from this use of the words among Latin authors that they found their way into the two solitary Greek MSS. in which they occur, those MSS. being accompanied by a Latin version. In the case of the Basle MS., cod. 156, great probability is given to this inference by the ignorance of the government of ἀπό, shown in the form in which the words occur—viz., ἀπο τῷ ξύλῳ, which can be best accounted for by the supposition that the words are a literal translation of a *ligno*.² It would appear, then, that this extensive use of the words among Latin authors, backed up by these two Græco-Latin MSS.,

¹ Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 194.

² *Ibid.* p. 189.

ought not to lead to the inference that they ever formed part of the LXX text. Besides the enormous preponderance of authority against them, there is the fact that, except to a person on the look out for Messianic prophecies which could by any means be twisted into applicability to Jesus of Nazareth, they do not appear to make any sense in the context.

To come to the conclusions we ought to draw. It seems, in the first place, we ought to conclude that Justin's differences from the LXX are not due to vagaries of his own, but that he followed some authority. The only other inference would be that all the other places in which the same differences are found are derived ultimately from Justin. Now Justin must have had some ground for his accusation against the Jews, and in whatever place he got the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, he might have got all the other differences. It is not credible that these words were ever part of the LXX. We may therefore suppose that Justin's authority was some sort of citation. If we suppose it to have been a catena of extracts, the insertion of these words can be most easily explained, for they are the last words in Justin's citation, and therefore might not improbably have really formed part of the next following citation in the catena. The catena which we have had reason to suppose Justin employed, was one originally made in Hebrew, translated into Greek, and afterwards collated with the LXX. It may not be possible to show evidence of this process in the citation we are dealing with, but such a process might, readily enough, produce its peculiarities. It would appear that the

Psalter as well as the Chronicles must have been collated in producing the text cited by Justin.

No inference can be drawn from the form of the quotation in 'Trypho.' The omission of the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου appears to show that it has been assimilated to the LXX by the hand of some copyist.

I will now pass on to consider what inference ought to be drawn from the foregoing facts with reference to our present inquiry.

The first is certainly this, that there was some secondary authority upon Messianic prophecy which was largely and blindly followed in the primitive Church, and that without referring the alleged prophecies to their context.

The second point which we may infer is that this authority was of such a nature that blunders of all sorts were made by using it, such as referring passages to the wrong authorities and causing them to be corrupted. We see further that Justin, in using this authority directly or indirectly, endeavoured to refer the passages to their context in the LXX, and when he could not find them accounted for his inability to identify them by supposing the copies of that version to have been mutilated by the Jews. But, notwithstanding, later writers appear to have continued to cite the passages as if there were no doubt of their authenticity.

These facts would be well accounted for by the extensive circulation of a catena of Messianic prophecies extracted from the Old Testament as well as from some apocryphal book or books which were accepted by the writer.

If we suppose this catena was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, and extracts were made in it from some book or books which were never translated into Greek, we can well understand how the source of some of these extracts should be unascertainable.

We have therefore here further evidence of the existence of such a work in the primitive Church, and even if this latter evidence is not so definite as to the exact character of the work as that we have had occasion previously to consider, of the existence of some work upon Messianic prophecy having wide circulation and authority in the primitive Church, it appears to be absolutely conclusive. On no other theory can we account for different writers, one after the other, citing and building their faith upon the same non-existent prophecies.

NOTE.—In the foregoing remarks I have not considered a theory which has been very prevalent in Germany though not in England. Critics who interpret *λόγια κυριακά* to mean 'the discourses of the Lord' often by an analysis of the synoptic gospels separate a part which they suppose to be derived from such a work. It is not to the purpose I have in hand to examine into the correctness of this analysis. It may well be that portions of the synoptic gospels are so separable, and can be shown to have come from such a work, but the work can hardly be that attributed to Matthew by Papias, for that work was written in Hebrew, while, as has been shown, the Old Testament citations in the discourses of Jesus invariably come from the LXX, and the discourses themselves dovetail into the citations in such a way as to show

that the original writer of them must have used the LXX. Admitting, therefore, that the criticism which discovers this book of discourses is correct, the book cannot have been that attributed by Papias to Matthew.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

REMARKS UPON THE TRANSLATION OF THE FRAGMENT OF PAPIAS RELATING TO MARK

THERE are three points in which my rendering of this passage is likely to be called in question.

(1) 'Without arrangement' for *οὐ τάξει*.

(2) 'Did not act wrongly' for *οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε*.

(3) 'Related' for *ἐμνημόνευσεν* and *ἀπεμνημόνευσεν*.

(1) Many critics translate *οὐ τάξει* 'not in chronological order.'

Thus Bleek says (*Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. § 48), '*οὐ τάξει*, when used in reference to an historical treatise, can only mean "not in the chronological order wherein the individual had done them."'

It is begging the question to assume that Papias was speaking of an historical treatise. But, passing this by, even of an historical treatise the remark is inaccurate; otherwise Gibbon for instance, when he pursues the method explained in his forty-eighth chapter, would be described as writing *οὐ τάξει*.

The things said and done by Christ might be arranged upon many different plans, e.g. according to the prophecies of which they were supposed to be the fulfilment, or the moral duties they enforced.

But this is, after all, rather beside the question. The word *τάξις*, when applied to a discourse or treatise, means arrangement generally, as when Aristotle, in the third book of his '*Rhetoric*,' says, *λοιπὸν δὲ περὶ τάξεως εἰπεῖν* ('it remains to speak about arrangement'). The denial of *τάξις*, therefore, to a treatise denies not merely chronological, but any sort of orderly arrangement.

How great a stumbling-block, however, this phrase (οὐ μὲν τοι ράξει) is in the way of any one who would apply the words of Papias to our second canonical gospel, may be seen by the efforts made to avoid it by a forced rendering. Thus in Clark's 'Anto-Nicene Library' it is rendered 'not, however, in *exact* order.'

(2) The rendering I have here adopted is substantially that made use of in the first instance by the author of 'Supernatural Religion' following certain German authorities, and afterwards somewhat modified in consequence of the acrimonious attacks of Dr. Lightfoot. The verb ἀμαρτάνειν may mean either to make a mistake, or to sin, or do what is morally blameworthy. The question is, what meaning has it in this passage? I think the latter, i.e. I think Papias means that Mark was not morally blameworthy for writing without arrangement. Papias has already said that what Mark related he wrote accurately (ἀκριβῶς). The rendering of Dr. Lightfoot would make a mere useless repetition of this statement.

Again ὥστε οὐδὲν ἡμαρτε Μάρκος is a consequence of what went before, viz. of the explanation why Mark wrote without arrangement. It is a natural consequence from that explanation that Mark ought not to be blamed for doing the best he could under the circumstances, but it would not be a natural consequence to say that he made no mistake. In other words, the antecedent stating the imperfection of his means of information, gives a reason why Mark might be excused for making mistakes, not for his not making any.

(3) Mark could not properly be said to have remembered the things said or done by Christ. What he might remember were the words of Peter. Moreover Papias goes on to say that Mark did not pass by any of the things which he *heard*. Papias therefore means that Mark committed to writing everything that Peter told him. To say that he wrote merely as many things as he remembered would imply that he had forgotten some. I therefore adopt the rendering 'related.'

APPENDIX II

PLACES IN WHICH ΛΟΓΩΝ OCCURS IN THE LXX

Numbers xxiv. 4, 15.

Sept. (Eng. Ver.)

Psalms xi. (xii.), 6.

„ xvi. (xviii.), 3.

„ xviii. (xix.), 14.

„ civ. (cv.), 19.

„ cvi. (cvii.), 11.

„ cxvii. (cxix.), 38, 50, 58, 67, 76, 82, 103, 133, 140, 148, 158, 162, 169, 170.

„ cxlvii. 15.

Isaiah xxviii. 13.

„ xxx. 27 twice.

Kircher gives several references which I was unable to verify, probably owing to using the common or Vatican text instead of the Aldine used by Kircher. He also refers to several places under the head Λόγων where the common text reads λογίων, meaning a part of the high priest's vestments.

APPENDIX III

PHILO THE AUTHOR OF THE 'DE VITA CONTEMPLATIVA'

It is, perhaps, due to the learned authorities who have disputed the genuineness of the 'De Vita Contemplativa' that I should state my reasons for differing from them.

Though always reputed a work of Philo's, from the time of Eusebius who makes the earliest extant mention of it downwards, it does not contain any direct statement as to who was its author, but it begins with a reference to the author having made mention in a previous treatise of the Essenes. We find such a treatise among the works ascribed to Philo in the 'Quod Omnis Probns Liber.'

This treatise again does not contain any statement as to its author, but it is addressed to one Theodotus, and makes reference

to a former treatise apparently addressed to the same person on the converse topic: 'Our former treatise, O Theodotus, was on every slave being bad' (*περὶ τοῦ πάντα δοῦλον εἶναι φαῦλον*). No such treatise is now extant, but we learn from Eusebius that he had in his hands a book ascribed to Philo under the title *περὶ τοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον*, which was no doubt the book referred to.

Putting aside for the present the possibility of the forgery of the 'De Vita Contemplativa,' the question is whether these three books were rightly ascribed to Philo, and the first book addressed to Theodotus, which would be the most likely of the three to contain any evidence of authorship, being lost, it is evident that we are in a very unfavourable position to review the judgment of Eusebius and others, who had that book in their hands, that Philo was the author of all three.

Proceeding however as best we may by the criticism of the two books which remain, the first point to consider is what internal evidence they contain of their date. Now in the book 'Quod Omnis Probus Liber,' cap. 12, we find the following passage: "Ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη καὶ Συρία καλοκάγαθους οὐκ ἄγνος ἦν πολυανθρωποῦτον ἔθνος τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὐκ ὀλίγη μύρα ἔμεται. Λέγονται τινες παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Ἑσσαιὶ πλῆθους ὑπὲρ τετρακισχίλιους καὶ ἑμὴν δόξαν. . . . αὐτοὶ ζῶσι καταθέοντες. This statement as to the large part of the very numerous nation of the Jews living in Palestine, could hardly have been made after the dispersion of the Jews by Titus, nor could the Essenes have been specially singled out as not sacrificing animals, after the destruction of the Temple had brought it to pass that all the Jews had ceased to sacrifice at all.

Again, a great part of the 'De Vita Contemplativa' is taken up by a description and denunciation of the extraordinary and scandalous luxury of the Italian banquets. Now we learn from Tacitus that this luxury came to an end when Vespasian invited the provincial families to Rome ('Ann.' lib. iii. cap. 55). Juvenal, who wrote under or after the Flavian dynasty, makes the niggardliness of entertainments a frequent theme for his satire, though he sometimes contrasts by way of emphasis the expense a rich glutton would be at for his own eating.

These indications of time support one another, and as we cannot suppose that had the war in Judaea been actually going

on, or only recently ceased, it would have escaped the notice of the writer, indicate some time before the commencement of that war as the latest date to which either book can be assigned.

Further, the writer of the books is a man well read in Greek literature, who is a Jew and not a Christian, and the books contain no allusion to the Messiah, or to any distinctly Christian doctrine. In particular, there is no allusion to any of the questions which originated in the teaching of Paul, e.g. to the lawfulness of Jews eating with Gentiles, or the necessity for circumcision.

Now when it is remembered that the writer is a Hellenizer who would evidently persuade his countrymen to follow his example in the zealous study of Greek literature, and to reconcile its teaching with that of their own sacred books by allegorical interpretations, it is certain that if the movement which originated in the teaching of Paul had taken place at the time he wrote, he would have felt much interested in it.

What view he might have taken of that movement we may not be able to say: whether he would have supported it, or have felt called on to defend himself from the charge, which would certainly have been made against him as a Hellenizer, of supporting it; but we may be certain that he would not have been able to pass by that movement in silence. The absence, therefore, in such a book as the 'De Vita Contemplativa' which deals especially with manners, of any reference to the Pauline movement, is strong evidence that the book was written before that movement originated, which will bring it to the age of Philo.

The notice of Egypt and Alexandria would lead further to the inference that that was the country of the author. But if it be conceded that the books are of the age of Philo, I do not suppose any one will care to dispute that their ascription to him is correct.

The writer gives a particular description of the mode of life of persons whom he calls Therapeutae, and Eusebius declares that there can be no doubt that the practices so described are the same as those which prevailed among Christians in his day. I do not dispute the accuracy of this identification, but it must be remembered that the doctrines held by the Therapeutae are not described with any exactness, though enough is said to show that they were not Christians, but Jews. There appears, therefore, no difficulty in supposing that the societies of Therapeutae, as

described in the 'De Vita Contemplativa,' existed in the time of Philo, being then composed of Jews; that they afterwards adopted the teaching of Paul and so became Christians, but that they continued their peculiar organisation and way of life, which thus found its way into the Christian Church.

I will now return to the question of the probability of the 'De Vita Contemplativa' being a forgery. Supposing the book to be genuine, it shows that a great mass of Christian customs which were currently supposed to have been instituted by the apostles were really much older, and must have come from some other source.

If the book be a forgery, it must have been the object of the forger to establish this conclusion. This is an object which I cannot attribute to any one in the first three centuries.

APPENDIX IV

VARIOUS QUOTATIONS AND RENDERINGS OF ISAIAH xlii. 1-4

ISAIAH xlii. 1-4, as quoted Matthew xii. 18-21:—

Ἰδοὺ, ὁ παῖς μου, ὃν ἡρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. Θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ. Οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κρινυγιάσει, οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. Κάλαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάξει, καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ σβέσει, ἕως ἂν ἐκβύβῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν. Καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.¹

The same passage, as quoted Justin, 'Dial.' c. cxxiii.:—

Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ ἐκλεκτός μου, θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει. Οὐκ ἐρίσει οὔτε κρίξει, οὔτε ἀκούσεται τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ· κάλαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάξει καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ μὴ σβέσει, ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει, κρίσιν ἀναλήψει, καὶ οὐ μὴ θρηνήσεται ἕως ἂν θῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κρίσιν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἐλπιοῦσιν ἔθνη.

¹ The passage from Matthew is quoted according to Griesbach. Westcott and Hort omit the εἰς in the phrase εἰς τὴν εὐδόκησεν, and Tregelles has, instead of this phrase, ἐν ᾧ ἡδόκησεν.

The same passage, as quoted Justin, 'Dial.' c. cxxxv.:—

Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσδέξεται αὐτόν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. Δέδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει. Οὐ κεκράζεται, οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω ἢ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ· κάλαμον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ σβέσει, ἕως ἂν νίκος ἐξοίσει, κρίσιν ἀναλήψει, καὶ οὐ θρηνήσεται, ἕως ἂν θῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κρίσιν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἐλπιοῦσιν ἔθνη.

The same passage, according to the LXX:—

Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσδέξεται αὐτόν ἡ ψυχὴ μου, ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει. Οὐ κεκράζεται, οὐδὲ ἰνῆσει, οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω ἢ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ. Κάλαμον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει, καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον οὐ σβέσει, ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει κρίσιν. Ἀναλήψει, καὶ οὐ θρηνήσεται ἕως ἂν θῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κρίσιν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν.

The Alexandrine codex reads κράζεται for κεκράζεται, and συντεθλασμένον for τεθλασμένον, and the fragments of Origen's 'Hexapla' disclose two other various readings, ὃν ἡρετίσεν for προσεδέξατο αὐτόν, and ἐν τῷ νόμῳ for ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι.

The same passage according to the revised English version: 'Behold my servant whom I uphold, my chosen in whom my soul delighteth. I have put my spirit upon him, he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break and the smoking flax shall he not quench, he shall bring forth judgment in truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law.'

The same passage according to the version of Mr. Cheyne: 'Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul is well pleased. I have put my spirit upon him, he shall cause the law to go forth to the nations. He shall not cry nor clamour, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A crushed (lit. crucked) reed he shall not break and a dimly burning wick he shall not quench, truthfully (more lit. 'according to the standard of truth') shall he cause the law to go forth. He shall not burn dimly, neither shall his spirit be crushed (lit. 'he shall not be dim nor be crucked') till he shall have set the law in the earth, and for his teaching the countries wait.'

According to Theodotion, as appears from the extant fragments of Origen's 'Hexapla,' the passage began, 'Ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήψεται αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκλεκτός μου ὃν ἠνέδεικσεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου, and it appears by the same authority that both Theodotion and Symmachus had *λίον ἀμαυρόν* instead of *λίον καπνίζόμενον*. Theodotion's rendering shows traces of the influence of the rendering of Matthew, or more probably of the source from which it was derived, but he cannot have followed that source at all closely as is shown in the rendering *λίον ἀμαυρόν* instead of *λίον τυφόμενον* in which Matthew and Justin agree. After writing the above, I came upon a careful study of the same passages in Dr. Hatch's 'Essays in Biblical Greek' (p. 199), to which I would refer those who wish to pursue the matter further.

APPENDIX V

THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF EUSEBIUS PAMPHILUS,

BOOK III. CHAPTER XXXIX

Of the writings of Papias.

WRITINGS of Papias, five in number, are in circulation, which have been entitled 'of an exposition of Dominical Oracles' (*Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως*). Of these Irenaeus also makes mention as alone written by him, saying somewhat as follows:—

'But these things Papias also, a man of primitive times who had been the hearer of John and the companion of Polycarp, testifies in writing in the fourth of his books. For there are five books composed by him.'

So far Irenaeus; but Papias himself in the introduction to his discourses shows himself to have been by no means a pupil and eyewitness of the holy apostles, but tells us by the words which he says that he received the things pertaining to the faith from those who were well known to them:—

'But I will not hesitate to arrange in order for you with the interpretations, whatever things at any time I well learned from the elders and well remembered, having thoroughly established the truth concerning them. For I did not, as most men, take

pleasure in those who say most, but in those who teach what is true, nor in those who relate the commandments of another man, but in those who relate the commandments given by the Lord to the faith and coming from the truth itself. But if anywhere any one came who had been a follower of the elders, I used to search after the words of the elders. What Andrew? or what Peter said? (*ἀνδρ*), or what Philip or what Thomas? or James? or what John? or Matthew? or any other of the disciples of the Lord, and the things which Aristion and John the elder, the disciples of the Lord, say (*λέγουσιν*). For I did not apprehend that things out of books profited me so much as what was said by the living and abiding voice.' Where also it is worthy to be noticed that he twice mentions the name of John, and the man of that name first mentioned he associates with Peter, James, and Matthew, and the rest of the apostles, clearly meaning the evangelist, but the other John he puts in a separate clause, and classes with others outside the number of the apostles, placing Aristion before him, and he clearly names him 'the elder.' So that through these things also is shown to be true the account of those who have said that there were two in Asia who bore the same name, and that there were two sepulchres in Ephesus and that each is still to this day called John's. To which things it is necessary to pay attention. For it is likely that the second, if one would not admit the first, beheld the revelation which is in circulation under the name of John. Papias also, of whom we are now speaking, acknowledges that he took the words of the apostles from those who had followed them, but says that he was himself a hearer of Aristion and John the elder. At least he frequently mentions them by name and places their traditions in his writings. And let not these things be said by us to no purpose.

It seems worth while, in addition to the before-quoted words of Papias, to touch upon other sayings of his in which he relates one extraordinary thing (*παράδοξα*) after another as having come to him from tradition.

That Philip the apostle stayed at Hierapolis with his daughters has been shown above, but that Papias, being contemporary with them, relates that he had received a wonderful statement from the daughters of Philip, must be now shown. He narrates the resurrection of a corpse having taken place in his time,

and again another extraordinary thing which happened about Justus who was surnamed Barsabas, as to his drinking a noxious drug and through the grace of God enduring no harm. And that this Justus after the ascension of the Saviour, the holy apostles both appointed with Matthias, and prayed over for the lot of filling up their number instead of the traitor Judas, the book of the Acts somewhat thus narrates:—

‘And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas who was surnamed Justus and Matthias, and they prayed and said—’

The same man has reported other things also as having come to him from unwritten tradition, both certain strange parables of the Saviour and teachings of his and some other things rather fabulous. Among which also he says that there will be, after the resurrection from the dead, a certain thousand years when the kingdom of Christ is corporally set up upon this earth. Which I believe he has imagined, having misconceived the apostolic narratives, not having understood the things said by them mystically in signs.

For he appears a man of exceedingly small understanding, to judge from his books, and yet he has become the cause of the like opinion with himself in very many who came after him of the ecclesiastical writers who have put forward the antiquity of the man, as, for instance, Irenaeus, and whoever else has declared that he thinks the same. And in his own book he hands down other statements of Aristion before described, of the words of the Lord, and traditions of John the elder. To which referring those eager to learn, we will be content to set forth a tradition in addition to those words of his before set out, which was set out about Mark who wrote the gospel, in these words.

‘And the elder said this. Mark having become the interpreter of Peter, as many things as he related either said or done by Christ, wrote correctly but not in order, for he neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterwards, as I said, followed Peter who used to make his teaching according to the occasion, but not as making an orderly compilation of dominical oracles [or discourses] so that Mark erred in no respect in thus writing some things as he related them. For of one thing he took care, not to pass by any of those things which he heard or to falsify anything in them.’

These things then have been narrated by Papias about Mark, but about Matthew these things have been told.

Matthew compiled the oracles in the Hebrew language, but each interpreted them as he was able.

The same man has used testimonies from the first epistle of John and of Peter. And he has set forth also another narrative about a woman falsely accused to the Lord of many sins, which the gospel according to the Hebrews contains. And let these things be observed by us cursorily in addition to the things explained.

There can, I think, be no doubt that ‘falsely accused’ is in the absence of cause to the contrary the proper rendering of the Greek *δυσλειτουργς*, but certain writers have a strong desire to see in this passage an allusion to the story of the woman taken in adultery to be found in the common text of the fourth evangelist, and influenced by this desire they translate the word ‘accused’ simply without the ‘falsely.’ Had the story mentioned by Papias been the well-known story contained in the fourth gospel, it is not likely that Eusebius would have referred it to the gospel according to the Hebrews. The use of the word *δυσλειτουργς* shows that the story mentioned by Papias must have been of a different cast, perhaps modelled on that of Susanna.

Even if *δυσλειτουργς* without any controlling context could be properly translated by the word ‘accused’ simply, it would be a very hazardous conjecture that it was the well-known story of the woman taken in adultery which was alluded to, but Mr. Harmer has, on the faith of this conjecture, printed the story in the list of fragments of Papias, and, what is more, by printing it in larger type has indicated that the MSS. of the gospel which contain this story ought to be supposed to tell it in the words of Papias. This is very far-fetched. Even if it is the story mentioned by Papias, the language of the fourth gospel would more probably be founded on that of the gospel according to the Hebrews.

Drs. Westcott and Hort give the rendering ‘maliciously accused,’ hoping that this, without doing violence to the Greek, might be made applicable to the story in the fourth gospel, but the word ‘maliciously’ is no more applicable than the word ‘falsely.’

The object of the accusers was not to injure the woman but to lay a trap for Jesus.

To the other learned writers who have contended that this passage contains an allusion to the woman taken in adultery must be added the late Dr. Hatch. He does so very obliquely by taking it for granted that the passage is an allusion to the woman taken in adultery, and citing it as an instance of a post-classical use of the word διαβάλλειν as applicable to a true accusation. As he devotes an article to the ecclesiastical use of the words διάβολος and διαβάλλω, we may presume that he produces all the evidence that his great learning enabled him to lay hands on. We see then that he has only one case to bring forward of a post-classical use of διαβάλλω in Luke xvi. 1. 'There was a certain rich man which had a steward, and the same was accused (δεδοληθη) unto him that he was wasting his goods.' Dr. Hatch says that this accusation was presumably true, and hence that the meaning of slander would be inappropriate, but this is not so. There is nothing in the context to require that the original accusation was true; the steward was afterwards called unjust on account of what he did after he knew he was to be dismissed, not on account of what he had done before.

It must be further noticed that if the difficulty as to the meaning of διαβάλλειν is surmounted, there remains the further difficulty that the woman in the fourth gospel is accused of one, not of many sins.

APPENDIX VI

DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS

I HAVE assumed in the text the common date of the crucifixion of Jesus, that is A.D. 33. This date is not by any means established beyond controversy, but a very simple consideration determines a posterior limit for it which will prevent any question with regard to it materially prejudicing my argument. The crucifixion cannot have been later than the last passover which occurred while Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judaea, and the facts stated by Josephus enable us to fix this date in such a way that it cannot be put later than A.D. 36.

Upon this I think everybody is agreed, though Keim contends that the last passover of Pontius Pilate should be put one year earlier, that is in A.D. 35.

The common date of the crucifixion is that adopted by Eusebius, who based his determination upon the statement in the third chapter of Luke, 'Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea . . . in the time of high priest (ἐπι ἀρχιερέως) Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias' (Eusebius, 'H. E.' lib. i. c. x.). There are several remarks to make upon this passage before considering how it is treated by Eusebius. The first is that it relates to the teaching of John, and only bears upon the period of the teaching of Jesus in that it is stated in all the gospels that Jesus began to teach during the teaching of John. The second remark is that, as applied to the teaching of John, the passage appears to present an inconsistency. The first part appears to fix a point of time for the commencement of that teaching, while the last part appears to indicate an extended period during which that teaching took place, and this difficulty does not vanish when the matter is looked into more closely, for we find from Josephus ('Antiquities,' xviii. cap. ii. 1) that Annas was appointed high priest by Quirinius at the conclusion of the census which was made in the thirty-seventh year after the battle of Actium, i.e. A.D. 6, and removed by Valerius Gratus some time in the first nine years of Tiberius, i.e. A.D. 14 to A.D. 23, and that after an interval of between two and three years, during which three different persons (Ismael, Eleazer, and Simon) were successively appointed and removed from being high priests, the same procurator appointed Caiaphas high priest who continued to hold the office all the rest of the time Gratus was procurator, and all the time his successor Pontius Pilate was procurator, after which he was removed by Vitellius, according to most authorities in A.D. 37, but according to Keim in A.D. 36. We thus see that Annas and Caiaphas were successively high priests for a period of thirty years or upwards, including the interval of from two to three years during which Ismael, Eleazer, and Simon held the office. It further appears from Josephus that Gratus was appointed procurator not long after the accession of Tiberius, and held the office for eleven years. The appointment of Caiaphas therefore cannot be put later than the

eleventh or by bare possibility the beginning of the twelfth year of Tiberius. These considerations show that the statement of Luke is inconsistent with itself. If John began to teach in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, he did not begin until at least six years after Annas had ceased to be high priest; and if John taught while Annas was high priest, he must have been teaching for at least six years before the fifteenth year of Tiberius.

The passage in Luke being thus difficult, the interpretation put upon it by Eusebius is still more difficult to follow. He appears to have taken it as applying directly to the teaching of Jesus, and to mean that his teaching comprised the interval between the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas. This interval, from the passage in Josephus I have referred to which Eusebius quotes, he makes out to have been something less than four years. How this can be does not appear. Josephus says that Ismael was deprived not long after (*μετ' οὐ πολὺ*) his appointment, and that Eleazer and Simon each held office a year, from which it would seem to follow that the three together must have been in office from two to three years. Of course by taking in part of the terms of office of Annas and Caiaphas it is easy to make four years or any time you please up to thirty years. But it is impossible in this way to get any determinate term. The only way I can at all follow the reasoning of Eusebius is by supposing that he means that he forms the conclusion upon the construction of the gospels that Jesus taught for something less than four years, and intends to show that this is consistent with his having taught under Annas and Caiaphas and for the interval between them, but this is not what Eusebius appears to say. However this may be, if four years for the duration of the ministry of Jesus are added to the fifteenth year of Tiberius we get the nineteenth year of Tiberius or A.D. 33 as the year of his death. The grounds of this determination are altogether untrustworthy, but though this is so the date itself is probably not very far wrong.

As a posterior limit to the date can be determined from our knowledge concerning the date of the removal of Pilate, so an anterior limit is fixed by the date of his appointment which Josephus tells us was ten years earlier. This would make the earliest possible date the passover of A.D. 26. The considerations available for determining the date within these limits are these.

All the gospels are agreed that Jesus was not crucified until after the execution of John the Baptist, an event which is mentioned by Josephus and of which the date can be approximately determined. Josephus tells us that John was executed by the orders of Herod, who feared he might raise a rebellion, and that the Jews thought a defeat suffered by an army of Herod's in a war against Aretas, King of Arabia Petraea, was a judgment of God in consequence. It is a probable inference that the defeat was not long after the execution of John, and moreover, Josephus tells us that John was executed at Macherus which just before the outbreak of the war he says was tributary to Aretas. We must therefore suppose that Herod had acquired the fortress during the hostilities, and that therefore John was not put to death until after the outbreak of the war. We thus get the execution of John fixed as having taken place after the outbreak of the war and before the defeat of Herod's army. Josephus begins his account of the war by stating that about this time or in this interval (*ἐν τούτῳ*) Aretas, the King of Arabia Petraea, and Herod had a quarrel. In the preceding section he had mentioned that Philip, Herod's brother, died in the twentieth year of Tiberius (August 19, A.D. 33 to August 19, A.D. 34). The war therefore must have begun about this date. Josephus also tells us that after the defeat Herod wrote and complained to Tiberius who ordered Vitellius, the President of Syria, to make war on Aretas, and that Vitellius in consequence collected an army which he was leading against Aretas when he was interrupted by the news of the death of Tiberius. As Tiberius died on March 16, A.D. 37, it follows that the defeat of Herod's army could not have been later than some time in A.D. 36. We thus fix the execution of John as taking place some time between the years A.D. 33 and A.D. 36. As we have already shown that the passover of A.D. 36 is the latest possible date for the crucifixion of Jesus, we are thus enabled to fix the passover of A.D. 33 as the earliest possible date. It appears improbable that the crucifixion of Jesus took place so late as A.D. 36, for in that event it would have been but a few months before the removal of Pilate, and it seems probable that his removal would have formed part of the traditions recorded in the gospels and would most likely have been looked upon by the primitive Christians as a judgment upon him. As this is not so, it would appear improbable that

the crucifixion was later than the passover of A.D. 35. Josephus mentions that the cause of the war between Herod and Aretas was the slight put by Herod upon his wife, the daughter of Aretas, in putting her away in order to marry Herodias, and he also says that Herod engaged to marry Herodias when he was setting out on a visit to Rome on some business, the nature of which he does not disclose. This intrigue was not discovered by Herod's wife until he returned from Rome, when she fled to her father and the war broke out. Now Keim with considerable probability conjectures that the business which took Herod to Rome, was to try and obtain from Tiberius the tetrarchy rendered vacant by the death of his brother Philip. If that is so, the duration of the journey of Herod to Rome, of his stay there and of his return, must be interposed between the death of Philip which cannot have been earlier than the latter part of A.D. 33 and the outbreak of the war. This would probably throw that event after the passover of A.D. 34, and so bring us to the passover of A.D. 35 as the date of the crucifixion of Jesus. This is a probable, but by no means a certain, conclusion, which is maintained by Keim.

Attempts have been made to determine the date of the crucifixion by astronomical computations. It is assumed that the tradition of the Church may be relied on that it took place on a Friday, and on a Friday which was the day after the day on which the passover was eaten. Now the passover was eaten on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, and the problem therefore is to determine on which of the possible years of the crucifixion the fifteenth day of the month Nisan fell on a Friday. The Jewish months are said to have commenced on the evening on which the new moon was first visible, and the month Nisan to be the month the moon of which came to the full first after the vernal equinox. Astronomers are able to calculate the day of the week upon which the moon which came to the full first after the vernal equinox in any year would, upon the supposition that the sky was clear, be first visible in Jerusalem, and several astronomers have made such calculations, and a table of the results may be found in Dr. Salmon's 'Introduction to the New Testament' (p. 274, 4th edition). Though no doubt as a matter of computation this table may be absolutely relied on, there are several sources of doubt in applying it to the determination of

the matter at issue. One is whether we have any warrant for supposing that the Jewish priests, who were not remarkable for being good astronomers, determined the vernal equinox correctly. Another doubt is as to whether the theory of fixing the commencement of the month by actual observation of the moon was adhered to. Keim ('Jesus of Nazara,' vi. 212) says it was, but various authorities cited in the article 'Chronology' in the ninth edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' (p. 714) appear to state that the Jews at the time of the Christian era made use of a cycle. Now as a lunation does not consist of an exact number of days, any cycle must proceed upon some system by which the deficiency of one month would be compensated by the excess of another, and this could scarcely be so adjusted that every month should begin on the precise day the new moon was first visible. If on the other hand the beginning of the month was determined in each case by observation, it must have been often delayed by the state of the weather.

There are other differences as to what the Jewish customs actually were. For instance, whether they reckoned the first day of the month as beginning with the evening on which the new moon appeared or at the preceding midnight, and as to whether they ate the passover on the evening which formed the end, or the evening which formed the beginning, of the fourteenth day of the month.

The better opinion would seem to be that the day began in the evening, and that the passover was eaten on the evening which formed the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth day of the month. Taking this to be so, if Jesus was crucified on a Friday, the passover must have been eaten as we should say the Thursday previous, which would be the fourteenth day of the month. The moon therefore must have been first visible, weather permitting, as we should say on a Thursday evening. Applying this to Dr. Salmon's table we see that in the year A.D. 34 there were two moons, either of which might have been the paschal moon; one the new moon of March 9, the other the new moon of April 7. The first might have been visible on Wednesday, March 10, and the second on Thursday, April 8, or perhaps not till Friday, April 9. This latter moon is the only moon in the table which would, weather permitting, have become first visible on a Thursday, and if it were necessary

that this condition should be fulfilled, April 23, A.D. 34, would be fixed as the date of the crucifixion, but the state of the weather might easily lead to the moon not being seen for a night or two. The moon which is marked on the table as first becoming visible on Wednesday, March 10, would therefore do as well, and so I think would the moon which is marked as becoming visible on Tuesday, March 29, A.D. 35.

When the moon is marked as not becoming visible till after Thursday, the case is different; the state of the weather could not lead to its being observed earlier. A.D. 33, when the moon would not be seen till Friday or Saturday, and A.D. 36, when the moon could not be seen till Sunday, would therefore be excluded.

The conclusions to be drawn from these astronomical considerations, whatever they may be worth, would therefore point to A.D. 34 or A.D. 35 as the year of the crucifixion.

So far as astronomical considerations go, the years A.D. 28 and A.D. 31 stand in nearly the same position as the year A.D. 35, though on other grounds they are excluded.

APPENDIX VII

EXTRACT FROM GEORGE HAMARTOLUS AND NOTE FROM THE
CODÆX BAROCCIANUS AS TO THE MARTYRDOM OF JOHN

THE entire passage from George Hamartolus is quoted in the following words by Mr. Harmer in the abridged edition of Lightfoot's 'Apostolic Fathers':—

Μετὰ δὲ Δομιτιανὸν ἐβασίλευσε Νερῶσις ἔτος ἑν, ὃς ἀνακαλεσάμενος Ἰωάννην ἐκ τῆς νήσου ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὸν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. μόνος τότε περιῶν τῷ βίῳ ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα μαθητῶν καὶ συγγραψάμενος τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίων μαρτυρίον καθξίωται. Πάππας γάρ ὁ Ἱερὰπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, αὐτόπτης τούτου, γενόμενος, ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων φησκει, ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνεμνήθη· πληρώσας δηλαδὴ μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ περὶ αὐτῶν πρόρρησιν καὶ τὴν ἐντῶν ὁμολογίαν περὶ τούτου καὶ συγκαταθεῖν· εἰπὼν γάρ ὁ Κύριος πρὸς αὐτούς· Δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω· καὶ κατανεύσαντων προθύμως καὶ συνθεμένων· Τὸ ποτήριόν μου, φησὶν, πίεσθε,

καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίσομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε. καὶ εὐκίτως, ἀδύνατον γὰρ Θεὸν ψεύσασθαι. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ πολυμαθὴς Ὁμηγεῖτης ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἐραρηνείᾳ διαβεβαιῶνται, ὡς ὅτι μεμαρτύρηκεν Ἰωάννης, ἐκ τῶν διδύχων τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑποσημαίνεμενος ταῦτα μεραθρῆναι. καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ὁ πολυώστερ Εὐσέβιος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἱστορίᾳ φησὶ· Οὐμῶς μὲν τὴν Παρθίαν εἰληχεν, Ἰωάννης δὲ τὴν Ἀσίαν, πρὸς οὓς καὶ διατρίψας ἐτελεύτησεν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.

It will be noticed that a full stop is placed after *καθξίωται*, thus making the quotation of Papias continue indefinitely down to *βαπτισθήσεσθε* or further. Whether this is Mr. Harmer's own punctuation or that of Nolte, from whom he takes the extract, and again if the punctuation be that of Nolte, whether it is found in the MS. or supplied by him, I do not know; but, however this may be, I think it is clearly erroneous. The statement of Papias is a parenthesis and ends with *ἀνεμνήθη*. Removing this full stop I render the passage as follows:—

'After Domitian Nerva reigned one year and he recalled John from the island and set him free to dwell in Ephesus. Being then the only one surviving out of the twelve apostles, and having written the gospel ascribed to him, he was thought worthy of martyrdom (for Papias, the bishop of Hierapolis, who was an eye-witness of him, says, in the second book of the Dominical Oracles, that he was killed by the Jews), having fulfilled certainly with his brother the prophecy of Christ about them, and their own compact and agreement about it. For the Lord having said to them, "Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink?" and they having eagerly assented and agreed, "My cup," he says, "ye shall drink, and with the baptism that I am baptised with shall ye be baptised." And it was as was to be expected, for it is impossible that God should lie. But so also the very learned Origen, in his commentary upon Matthew, maintains strongly, having subscribed that he had learned this from the successors of the Apostles that John was a martyr; and indeed Eusebius also, the great scholar, says in his ecclesiastical history that Thomas was allotted Parthia but John Asia, where, having spent his days, he came to an end at Ephesus.'

The note from the codex Baroccianus is given by Mr. Harmer in the same work in the following words:—

Πάππας Ἱερὰπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος ἀκουστὴς τοῦ θεολόγου Ἰωάννου γενόμενος, Πολυκάρπῳ δὲ ἐταῖρος, πέντε λόγους κυριακῶν λογίων

ἔγραψεν, ἐν οἷς ἀπαριθμήσιν ἀποστόλων ποιούμενος μετὰ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, Φίλιππον καὶ Θωμᾶν καὶ Ματθαῖον εἰς μαθητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνέγραψεν Ἀριστιῶνι καὶ Ἰωάννῃ ἑτερον ὃν καὶ πρεσβύτερον ἐκάλεσεν. ὥς τις οἶσθαι, ὅτι [ins. τούτου] τοῦ Ἰωάννου εἰσὶν αἱ δύο ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ μικραὶ καὶ καθολικαί, αἱ ἐξ ὀνόματος Ἰωάννου φερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀρχαίους τὴν πρώτην μόνην ἐγκρίνειν· τινὲς δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τούτου πλανηθέντες ἐνόμισαν. καὶ Πάπας δὲ περὶ τὴν χιλιονταετηρίδα σφύλλεται, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἡ Εἰρηναῖος. Πάπας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει, ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῆρέθησαν. Πάπας ὁ εἰρημένος ἰστορήσεν ὥς παραλαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν θυγατέρων Φιλίππου, ὅτι Βαρσαβᾶς ὁ καὶ Ἰούστος δοκιμαζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπίστων ἰὼν ἐχίδνης πίων ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπαθὴς διεφυλάχθη. ἰστορεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα θαύματα καὶ μάλιστα τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέτερα Μαννίμου τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστᾶσαν· περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντων, ὅτι ὥς Ἀδριανὸς ἔξω.

I think Mr. Harmer or his authority is in error in putting a full stop after ἐκάλεσεν, and in supposing the words that follow to be in the oblique narration and consequently the words of Papias. The construction is ὥς with the infinitive introducing a consequence. The punctuation and construction adopted by Mr. Harmer leads to the absurdity that Papias is made to have speculated as to the authority of the two short epistles ascribed to John, and to have considered that they were the work of the John he was acquainted with, and not of the apostle, because the primitive fathers only accepted the first epistle. Who can these primitive fathers have been from whose conduct Papias drew this inference? They cannot have been the elders from whom he collected his traditions, or he would have asked them the question point blank and been able to narrate their answer. The opinion is evidently that of a much later writer than Papias; probably Jerome was the originator of it (see passage referred to in the text).¹ The silence of Eusebius in this case is of weight. He expressly mentions that Papias used the first epistle of John. If Papias had noticed the two other epistles he would also have mentioned it.

I add a translation of the entire passage:—'Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who had been a hearer of John the Divine and a

¹ Ante, p. 37.

companion of Polycarp, wrote five books of Dominical oracles, in which, making an enumeration of the apostles, after Peter and John, Philip and Thomas and Matthew, he recorded as disciples of the Lord Aristion and another John whom he also called elder, so that some think that the two short catholic epistles which are in circulation under the name of John are the works of this John, because the ancients accept the first only. But some erroneously considered the Apocalypse also the work of this John. And Papias also is mistaken about the millennium, and, following him, Irenaeus. Papias in his second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were killed by the Jews. The aforesaid Papias has narrated as having received it from the daughters of Philip that Barsabas, who is also called Justus, being tested by the unbelievers, drinking the poison of a viper in the name of the Christ, was preserved harmless. But he narrates also other wonders, and especially that concerning the mother of Manaimus, who was raised from the dead. About those raised from the dead by the Christ that they lived until Hadrian. . . .

APPENDIX VIII

EXTRACTS FROM ANASTASIIUS OF SINAI

Anastasius Sinaita, *Contempl. Anagog.* in *Hexaem.* i.

SED quoniam earum quas subiecinus dubitationum exitum non invenimus, et in eis plane perplexi sumus, et omnino haesitamus, freti ore sancti spiritus: Pauli, inquam, lingua, quae dicit quod quaecumque sunt in lege, prius scripta sunt in figuram Christi et ipsius ecclesiae: accepta, si vere dicere oportet, occasione ex Papias viro clarissimo Hierapolitano, qui dixit in Epistothio Clemente, et Pantuano Alexandrino sacerdote, et Ammonio sapientissimo, interpretibus veterum et primorum conventionem, qui totum Hexaemeron intellexerunt de Christo et Ecclesia, post vere sensilem secundum literam creationem, citra ullam dubitationem sensum speculantes Ecclesiae, pro qua universus est nostri certaminis scopus, ad hoc opus descendimus. (Migne, 'P. G.' lxxxix. p. 860).

Anastasius Sinaita in 'Hexaemeron' vii.:—

Οἱ μὲν αὖν ἀρχαιότεροι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐξηγητῶν, λέγων δὲ Φίλων ὁ φιλόσοφος καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁμόχρονος καὶ Πάπας ὁ πολὺς ὁ

Ἰωάννου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ φοιτητῆς ὁ Ἱεροπολίτης Εἰρηναῖός τε ὁ Λουγδουνιεύς καὶ Ἰουστίνος ὁ μάρτυς καὶ φιλόσοφος Πανταίετός (lego Πάνταινός) τε ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς καὶ Κλήμης ὁ Στρωματεὺς καὶ οἱ ἄμφ' αὐτοὺς, πνευματικῶς τὰ περὶ παραδείσου ἐθεωρήθησαν (forte ἐθεώρησαν) εἰς τὴν Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ἀναφερόμενοι. Ἐξ ὧν εἴναι καὶ οἱ περὶ πάντα πάνσοφοι δύο Καππαδόκει Γρηγόριοι. Ἄπαιτες οὗτοι ἐξ αἰτίων τοιῶνδε φάσκοντες εἶναι καὶ πνευματικὸν τινα παρὰ-διδουν.

Primum, quod si Adam non erat interitus obnoxius quando factus est, perspicuum quod non fuit particeps alimenti terrestris et in quod cecidit interitus. Quod si poterat esse particeps ciborum sensilium, est etiam perspicuum quod in eum cecidit interitus (quidquid enim intrat per os rursus excremitur). Si autem in eum cadebat interitus, omnino erat etiam mortalis; si autem creatus est mortalis, non utique facta est mors per inobedientiam: atque haec quidem est prima causa interpretum (Migne, 'P. G.' lxxix. p. 961). Lightfoot, 'A. F.', abridged ed. p. 521.

APPENDIX IX

NOTICE OF PAPIAS BY JOHN MALALAS

Ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκθέσεως Ἰωάννου Ἀντιοχείως τῆς περὶ χρόνων καὶ κτίσεως κόσμου ποιηθείσης, ὡς φησιν, ἀπὸ βιβλίων Μωσέως, Ἀφρικανοῦ, Εὐσεβίου, Παπίου καὶ Διδύμου, καὶ ἐτέρων.

Πρώτος ἐκ γῆς ἄνθρωπος πλασθεὶς ὁ Ἀδάμ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ εἶχε μέτρον ἡλικίας ποδῶν 5' μετὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ κεφαλῆς, κ.τ.λ.—Cramer, 'Anecdota Graecae codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis,' vol. ii. p. 379.

APPENDIX X

EXTRACTS FROM DIONYSIUS THE AIREOPAGITE AND MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR

"Ἄλλοι δέ, οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ἐπὶ προσόλους ἐννοίαις ἀποκλιθέντες, εἰρήκασιν ὁμοειδῆ τοῦ τῆδε βίου τὴν τοῖς ὁσίοις ἐπηγγελμένην ἀγιωτάτην καὶ μακαριωτάτην λῆξιν, καὶ τροφὴς οἰκείας ἀλλοιωτῶ βίῳ τοῖς ἰσαγγέλοις ἀθεμίτως ἀπέριμψαν. Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἀποπσεύεται τίς ποτε

τῶν ἱερωτάτων ἀνδρῶν εἰς τὰς τοιαύτας πλάνησεις. — Dionysius Aereopag., 'De Eccl. Hierarch.' cap. vii. (Migne, 'P. G.' iii. 553).

Ταῦτά φησιν αὐταῖτιμος, αἵμαι, Παπῖον τὸν Ἱεροπόλεως τῆς κατ' Ἀσίαν τότε γενομένου ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ συνακρίσαστα τῷ Θεῷ εὐαγγελιστῇ Ἰωάννῃ. Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Παπῖος ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ αὐτοῦ βιβλίῳ τῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεων τὰς διὰ βρωμάτων εἶπεν ἐν τῇ ἀνιστάσει ἀπολαύσεις· εἰς ὅπερ δόγμα μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπίστευσεν Ἀπολλινάριος, [καθὼς ἐμφαίνεται ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι αὐτοῦ] ὁ καλοῦσι τινες χιλιωταετηρίδα. Πῶς οὖν Ἀπολλινάριον τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Διονυσίου συγγράμματα κατὰ τοὺς τιῶν λήρους τὰ ἀναρῶντα Ἀπολλινάριον; καὶ Εἰρηναῖος δὲ ὁ Λουγδούνου ἐν τῷ Κατὰ αἰρέσεων πέμπτῳ λόγῳ τὸ αὐτὸ φησι καὶ παράγει μάρτυρα τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰρημένων τὸν λεχθέντα Παπῖον.—Maximus Confessor, Scholium on the above passage (Migne, 'P. G.' iv. 176).

Maximi Scholia in Lib. de Coelesti Hierarchia:—

Σὺ δέ, ὦ παῖ· Πῶς παῖδα καλεῖ τὸν θεῖον Τιμόθεον ὁ Μέγας Διονύσιος ζητητέον· ἡ γὰρ ὡς αἵμαι αἶτε προβεβηκώς αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔτεσι, τοῦτο φησι καὶ τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ προέχων ὡς καὶ προεωτάσθαι παρ' αὐτὰν, καθὼς δηλοῖ τὰ μετὰ χειρὸς συγγράμματα· κἄν γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ θεοῦ Διονυσίου ἐπίστευσεν ὁ ἅγιος Τιμόθεος, ὡς αἱ ἱράξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων δηλοῦσιν, ἀλλ' οὖν τὴν ἐξω παιδείαν ἰκανώτερος ἦν ὁ μέγας Διονύσιος· ἡ παῖδα καλεῖ αὐτὸν, ὡς μιμούμενος τὸν Κύριον λέγοντα· Παιδί μὴ τι προσφάγων ἔχετε; ἡ ἐπειδὴ τοὺς κατὰ Θεὸν ἁκακίαν ἀσκούτας παῖδας ἐκάλεον, ὡς καὶ Παπῖος δηλοῖ βιβλίῳ πρώτῳ τῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεων καὶ Κλήμης ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἐν τῷ Παιδαγωγῷ (Migne, 'P. G.' iv. 48).

APPENDIX XI

DATE OF THE MARTYRDOM OF POLYCARP

IRENÆUS describes Papias as the hearer of John, but the companion of Polycarp. Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἐταῖρος. This would seem to imply that in the opinion of Irenæus Polycarp and Papias were, if not men of about the same age, at all events men of the same generation, and it makes the age of Polycarp, if ascertainable, some index to that of Papias. Irenæus gives several particulars about Polycarp, but no precise dates: that he was taught by apostles; that he had lived among many who had seen the Christ; that he was appointed by

apostles, bishop in the church in Smyrna; that he lived to a very great age; that he paid a visit to Rome when Anicetus was bishop, and was there at Easter; that he suffered a glorious martyrdom. The three first of these statements would probably be derived from the statements of Polycarp himself, and must be taken with caution as the statements of a man magnifying his own position, and more especially as the statements of an old man magnifying the transactions of his youth. Care must also be given to the sense in which he may have used the words apostle and bishop. The former word has come to be the designation of thirteen, or say fourteen men, and as applied to these men it is not used univocally. Twelve men, though there is some doubt about the precise individuals, are said to have been appointed by Jesus to the office in his lifetime; one is said to have been formally elected by the remaining eleven apostles in the place of Judas Iscariot, and Paul laid claim to the office on subjective grounds, which the church has finally admitted. Besides Paul, Barnabas is sometimes styled an apostle, and it is probable that others among the original preachers of Christianity were so styled in their own time. Probably the apostles who taught Polycarp and appointed him bishop, were John the elder and Aristion. We must also remember that the word bishop, in early times, did not mean an officer who exercised the sole authority, but one of a body of men. The appointment to the office of bishop in the days of Polycarp would, therefore, amount to no more than ordination does among us. We see, therefore, that these statements merely involve that Polycarp attained the age of three- or four-and-twenty before the end of the first century. For him to have suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius, as stated by Eusebius, he must have lived to be eighty-four or eighty-five years old. Dr. Lightfoot, after an exhaustive examination of the authorities, places the accession of Anicetus to the see of Rome at from A.D. 153 to A.D. 155.¹ Polycarp would, therefore, have been at least seventy-six or seventy-seven, or more probably a year or two older, at the time of his visit. These dates are all possible, though they make rather extreme suppositions. Thus we have to suppose that Aristion, as well as John the elder, lived to extreme old age,

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. 343.

that when very old he and John the elder took part in the ordination of Polycarp at an age which must be considered young, and that Polycarp, when seventy-six or upwards, took a journey from Smyrna to Rome. It is not improbable that the age at which Polycarp took this journey ought to be increased a year or two. Dr. Lightfoot, whose computation of the date of Anicetus has been taken, held that the martyrdom of Polycarp took place in the February of A.D. 155. He was, therefore, under strong inducements to place the accession of Anicetus at a time which would render this date possible; he has accordingly taken the duration of the episcopate of Eleutherus¹ at fifteen years, in accordance with the chronicle of Eusebius, which we have only in versions, rather than at thirteen years, in accordance with the 'Ecclesiastical History.' If the shorter period be adopted, Anicetus would not succeed before A.D. 155 at the earliest, and as the visit of Polycarp to Rome, in the time of Anicetus, is the best attested fact we have about him, his martyrdom at Smyrna in February 155 would become impossible.

Polycarp is stated by Eusebius ('H. E.' iv. 14, 15) to have suffered martyrdom during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (7 March 161 to 17 March 180). M. Waddington has propounded an earlier date, A.D. 155. The grounds upon which this date is founded are as follows: there is extant a letter purporting to be written by the Church of Smyrna to the Church of Philomelium giving an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp. It is stated at the end of this letter that Polycarp was martyred in the proconsulship of Statius Quadratus. There are also extant certain orations of one Aelius Aristides, a rhetorician, written in praise of Aesculapius. By piecing together notices contained in these orations M. Waddington² was able to determine that Statius Quadratus was proconsul of Asia in the year A.D. 155, or a year or two before or after. This determination has been accepted by many critics, and I do not propose to take any exception to it, but its application to the determination of the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp depends upon the statement in the letter purporting to come from the Church of Smyrna, that Polycarp

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. 326.

² While correcting the proofs I read with regret of the death of this distinguished statesman and scholar.

was martyred in the proconsulship of Statius Quadratus. This letter purports to be written by eye-witnesses; if, therefore, it is genuine, there can be no ground to question any statement of that character contained in it. But the genuineness of the letter has been questioned by many critics on different grounds.

Some MSS. which contain this letter, contain also a life of Polycarp; this life is acknowledged to be altogether unauthentic. It is full of foolish miracles, of which the following is a specimen. Polycarp being the slave of a lady, notwithstanding his youth she gives him the charge of her property while she goes on a journey; while she is away he steals all the contents of her stores and gives them to the poor. When his mistress returns, the other servants, who are jealous of Polycarp, hasten to tell her. Polycarp, thereupon, beseeches the Lord who immediately refills the stores.

This life is anonymous, but the letter has annexed to it a sort of postscript, which purports to be written by one, Pionius, and it has been inferred, with considerable probability, that the same person was the author of the life. Dr. Lightfoot considered that the life, as we now have it, is incomplete, and that in its completed state it embodied the letter. The question at once presents itself whether the letter itself may not be the work of the author of the life. If so, it may be presumed that, like the life, it is altogether a fiction. In this aspect the date of the life becomes material. It was certainly known and treated as authentic by Macarius Magnes,¹ about the end of the fourth century, who cites incidents from it including the miracle we have noticed. Eusebius was acquainted with the letter, and borrowed largely from it in his 'Ecclesiastical History,' but he does not make any notice of the life. An argument might perhaps be based upon this, that the life was not then in existence, but it appears that Eusebius quoted the letter from a book containing accounts of martyrdoms, for he proceeds immediately afterwards to quote accounts of other martyrdoms from the same source. (*Ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ γραφῇ καὶ ἄλλα μαρτύρια συνήπητο κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν Σμύρναν πεπραγμένα ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν περιόδον τοῦ χρόνου τῆς τοῦ Πολυκάρπου μαρτύριος μεθ' ὧν καὶ Μητροδώρος τῆς κατὰ Μαρκίωνα πλάνης πρεσβύτερος, κ. τ. λ.*)

¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii., 1885, p. 1012; *ibid.* vol. i. p. 545.

The martyrdom of this Metrodorus and of the others which follow are not related in the letter of the Smyrneans, but are now extant in a separate document. The authority followed by Eusebius would therefore appear to have been some treatise on martyrdoms compiled from various sources, and the writer of such a treatise, finding the letter of the Smyrneans in the life of Polycarp, might not improbably extract it nearly verbatim without noticing the rest of the life.

It would appear therefore that no inference can be drawn as to the non-existence of the life from Eusebius not mentioning it. Apart from the silence of Eusebius there is nothing but internal evidence as to the date of the life, which consists of nothing else but the state of doctrinal controversy disclosed by it. The writer intended to make use of the name of Polycarp to support the doctrines to which he was attached, and for this purpose put into his mouth a tolerably complete creed; when this creed is looked at, it is seen to be very precise in condemning the Montanists, but to be altogether silent upon the Arian controversy. This leads to the assumption that the life was written at some time when the church was much troubled by the Montanist heresy, but before the Arian controversy had arisen, that is to say, certainly some time before the year A.D. 319, but probably we may say some time in the third century. Dr. Lightfoot has attempted to fix a later date for this life. His argument is as follows:—

'But when did this false Pionius live? He interests himself in the Quartodeciman controversy, and he represents St. Paul (§ 2) as teaching two things respecting the celebration of Easter: (1) That it must be kept during the feast of unleavened bread and not outside this season as is done by the heretics, especially the Phrygians; and (2) That it need not of necessity be held on the fourteenth day. The second point is a protest against the Quartodecimans. As Polycarp himself was well known to have been a Quartodeciman, this statement could hardly have been made till the earlier history of the Quartodeciman controversy had passed out of memory. The first injunction has reference to certain Montanists and others in the fourth and fifth centuries who like the former disregarded the day of the week, but unlike them put aside the Jewish lunar reckoning and adopted the Roman Calendar instead, celebrating the passion on a fixed day in March or April which they supposed to have been

the actual day of the crucifixion, though differing among themselves in their calculations (Epiphanius, *Haer.* i. i., Sozomen, *II. E.* vii. 18, Anon. Sermon in Pasch. 7 in Chrysostom, *Op.* viii. 2, p. 276; see Duchesne, p. 10). This points to a time not earlier than the middle of the fourth century, and no notice in the work suggests a prior date.

'It may seem strange perhaps that an author writing after the great Christological disputes of the fourth and succeeding centuries had begun should not indicate his views on the points of dispute, but they had no reference to the subject before him, and apparently he took no special interest in them.'

No weight can be given to the argument drawn from the opposition shown by the writer of the life to the Quartodeciman heresy. He shows a consciousness of the real opinions of Polycarp, and that they were well known, by putting the arguments against it into the mouth of Paul, not of Polycarp. In fact Paul seems to be mentioned for no other purpose. It is in fact an ingenious device to make a panegyric upon Polycarp the vehicle for an attack upon a doctrine of which he was known to have been a principal supporter.

The argument drawn from the Montanist variation of the doctrine is only valid upon the assumption that this doctrine can be shown not to have existed before the fourth century. Now the references given by Dr. Lightfoot do not at all bear this out. It may be that this particular heresy is not mentioned by any writer earlier than Epiphanius who wrote in the latter half of the fourth century. But this does not by any means show that the doctrine itself is not a century older. There is nothing in Epiphanius to suggest that the heresy he is describing was then new; on the contrary he describes it as a variation of the Quartodeciman heresy among the heresies of the second century, the next heresy he mentions being that of the Alogi which he expressly states to have sprung up after it.² But apart from this there is no reasonable ground upon which it can be urged that the doctrine did not arise until just before Epiphanius described it. The Montanists had then existed as a sect for two centuries,

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 1885, p. 1011.

² Epiphanius, *Adv. Haer.* lib. ii. tom. i.; *Haer.* li. Migne, *P. G.* xli. 888.

and we know that their doctrines had become "crystallised" long before his time. Epiphanius twits them with it. 'How,' he says, 'is it that after Montanus and Priscilla and Maximilla you no longer have prophets?' and again, repeating the words of Maximilla, 'After me there will be no longer a prophetess.'¹ It would seem probable therefore that the practice of observing Easter according to a fixed day of the calendar month was a part of the original Montanist doctrine. In the '*Philosophumena*' (book viii. chap. xii.), a work of the early part of the third century, the Montanists are said to introduce novelties of fasts and feasts which would seem to be an allusion to this practice. I do not know any other such novelty attributed to them. It must be noticed that as the life was written before the end of the fourth century, if not written before the Arian controversy began, it must have been written in the height of that controversy. It is improbable that the writer would be so unmoved by this controversy, which convulsed the world around him, that no trace of it can be seen in his book, while he troubles himself to forgo arguments against the then obscure sect of the Montanists. It is far more probable that he wrote during the third century when the Montanist movement still troubled the Church.

It must be noticed that the date of the life is only material upon the supposition that Dr. Lightfoot and others are right in concluding that the author of the life is the same as the author of the postscript to the letter which I will now proceed to quote in the translation of Dr. Lightfoot.

'This account Gaius copied from the papers of Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp. The same also lived with Irenaeus.

'And I Socrates wrote it down in Corinth from the copy of Gaius. Grace be with all men.

'And I Pionius again wrote it down from the afore-mentioned copy, having searched it out (for the blessed Polycarp showed me in a revelation as I will declare in the sequel), gathering it together where it was well-nigh worn by age, that the Lord Jesus Christ may gather me also with His elect into His heavenly kingdom: to whom be the glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit for ever and ever, Amen.'²

¹ *Adv. Haer.* lib. ii. tom. i.; *Haer.* xlvii. Migne, *P. G.* xli. 857.

² *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 1066.

It is not, I think, possible to contend that this statement is true. Dr. Lightfoot does not do so.¹ What he contends is that it is as it purports to be—the work of a writer different from the writer or writers of the letter to which it is appended. But the question arises, Why should anyone append such a memorandum to a genuine letter? If we suppose the letter to have been forged by the same person who wrote the postscript, the object is obvious—he wished to remove an objection which he felt would be raised to the reception of his forgery. People would say, he thought, How was it we knew nothing about this letter before? How does it now appear for the first time? And if, as Dr. Lightfoot supposes, the letter was inserted bodily in a life of Polycarp, the further question would be asked, How did the author get hold of it? The statements in the postscript are calculated to remove these difficulties; it is difficult to see for what other purpose they can have been intended. It would be ridiculous to append such statements to a letter already in circulation. Why, it would be asked, should the ghost of Polycarp appear to Pionius to show him a worn and tattered copy of a document which he could have got in good condition from any bookseller, and (on Dr. Lightfoot's hypothesis as to dates) have read nearly verbatim in the 'Ecclesiastical History' of Eusebius? It would appear, therefore, to follow from the mere consideration of the postscript that the letter is a forgery.

The letter itself contains much to strengthen this conclusion. It contains many miracles. Thus, three days before his apprehension, Polycarp while praying fell into a trance and saw his pillow burning with fire, and he turned and said unto those that were with him, 'It must needs be that I shall be burned alive.'² Again, as he entered the stadium, a voice came to him from heaven, 'Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man.'³ The actual martyrdom is told in the following words: 'When he (Polycarp) had offered up the Amen and finished his prayer, the firemen lighted the fire. And a mighty flame flashing forth we to whom it was given to see saw a marvel, yea and we were preserved that we might relate what happened to the rest. The fire, making the appearance of a vault like the sail of a vessel filled by the

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 593.

² Letter, s. 5.

³ *Ibid.* s. 9.

wind, made a wall round about the body of the martyr, and it was there in the midst not like flesh burning but like a loaf in an oven or like gold or silver refined in a furnace. For we perceived such a fragrant smell as if it were the wafted odour of frankincense or some other precious spice. So at length the lawless men, seeing that his body could not be consumed by the fire, ordered an executioner to go up to him and stab him with a dagger, and when he had done this there came forth a dove and a quantity of blood so that it extinguished the fire, and all the multitude marvelled that there should be so great a difference between the unbelievers and the elect.'¹

The mention of the dove in this passage has been a great stumbling-block in all ages. Eusebius, or the authority he followed, altogether omitted it. More or less ingenious emendations of the Greek text have been suggested by different writers to avoid the difficulty. Thus, instead of *περὶ στέρνα καὶ*, 'a dove, and,' Ruchat conjectures *περὶ στέρνα*, 'about his breasts,' and Le Moyne *ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ*, 'on the left,' and Wordsworth *περὶ στέρνα*, 'about the butt spike.'² If Polycarp had been dispatched with the butt of a spear instead of with a dagger, *ξυπίδιον*, this conjecture would have been very plausible, as it simply changes one Greek letter and omits another, but daggers have not butt spikes. It is against all such emendations which are not inadmissible as making nonsense, that they do not account for the omission of the phrase by Eusebius. Dr. Lightfoot supposes the words *περὶ στέρνα καὶ* to be an interpolation of the author of the postscript. He remarks as follows: 'If then the spurious Pionius be the author of this postscript, he is responsible for the edition of the Smyranean epistle. Our Greek and Latin copies have the Pionian postscript and therefore represent the Pionian edition. Eusebius alone of all extant authorities is prior to the false Pionius and gives an independent text. Now our spurious Pionius was before all things a miracle-monger. Among other miracles he relates that on the eve of Polycarp's appointment to the episcopate a white dove was seen hovering about his head and around it a circle of light. As a dove thus visited Polycarp

¹ Letter, s. 15, 16; *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 1063.

² *Ibid.* part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 976 n.

preparatory to his consecration, so also a dove is found leaving him, or at least leaving his body, when his spirit is wafted to heaven. But this miracle appears only in the Pionian copies, not in Eusebius; moreover, by the abruptness of its appearance an interpolation is suggested. Is it not the same dove which appears on the two occasions, and was it not uncaged and let fly by the same hand? We cannot resist the suspicion that our spurious Pionius was responsible for both these appearances.¹

We have shown that there is no reason for the assumption that Eusebius is prior to the false Pionius, and it appears a rash conclusion that the mention of the dove is an interpolation. Though the appearance of the dove is the incident in the letter least capable of a subjective explanation, the whole narrative is so highly miraculous that there can be no reason to suggest the intervention of a different hand, and besides the context requires some notable miracle: 'we to whom it was given to see saw a marvel, yea and we were preserved that we might relate what happened to the rest.' The arguments of Dr. Lightfoot, therefore, go to show that the letter proceeds from the author of the life. Of this there is another indication. The life, as has been noticed, shows an especial animosity to the Montanists, called, from the place where the heresy originated, the Phrygians. In the letter a story is told of a Phrygian who, having come forward of his own free will, when he saw the wild beasts lost courage and offered incense. Grammatically a native of Phrygia is all that is meant. But the story, none the less, suggests an intention to attack the Montanists. This is another indication of the same hand that wrote the life.

There is yet another considerable objection to the genuineness of the letter. It states twice, once in the body of the letter and once at the end, that Polycarp suffered on Great Sabbath, (*ὁυτος σαββάτου μεγάλου, σαββᾶτω μεγάλῳ*). By Great Sabbath the early Christians who were orthodox meant the Saturday between Good Friday and Easter Sunday. But this letter, if genuine, must have been written by the Church of Smyrna, and the Church of Smyrna at and long after the martyrdom of Polycarp was Quartodeciman, that is to say, they fixed Easter by

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 628.

the day of the month without regard to the day of the week. With them, therefore, such a day as Great Sabbath, as understood by the orthodox, could not occur. We have therefore a very strong argument that the letter is a forgery, the writer being either ignorant that the Smyrnæans were Quartodecimans, or, what is more probable, intentionally misimputing to them orthodox phraseology in order to make evidence against the Quartodeciman heresy. This we see the writer of the life would be likely to do, as he there puts fictitious teaching into the mouth of Paul for the same purpose. It would take very long to set out all the attempts that have been made to explain away this difficulty. They appear to fall under three heads: First, that the Quartodecimans used the phrase 'Great Sabbath' in some sense of their own, we can only guess at. As regards explanations of this class, it must be conceded that we have not sufficiently accurate knowledge of the Quartodeciman usages absolutely to exclude such a conjecture, but we know nothing to give it the least probability. In the only sense, as far as we know, in which the name was applied by Christians, it was inapplicable to the Quartodeciman usages.

The second explanation, that of Dr. Lightfoot, is that a Jewish festival was intended. To this it must be answered, that this does not appear admissible on the language of the letter. The fact is twice stated nakedly without any reference to the Jews. The third explanation, a modern supporter of which is Lipsius, is that the mention of Great Sabbath both in the postscript and in the body of the letter is spurious. This would be indeed an effectual answer if it could be sustained, but the reading is supported by all the authorities, including Eusebius. It is however interesting to note of two such learned critics that Lipsius is constrained to deal with Great Sabbath as Lightfoot with the dove. Closely connected with the statement that the martyrdom took place on Great Sabbath, is the statement of the day of the month on which it took place, which in the different Greek MSS. and Latin version of the letter, and the Paschal Chronicle founded on it, assumes no less than five different forms which may be restored as follows, by aid of the critical apparatus of Dr. Lightfoot.¹

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. 983, 984.

According to the MS. known as Baroccianus described as 'b,' it runs thus:—

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος μηνὸς ἑξανθηκοῦ δευτέρᾳ ἱσταμένου πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαίων σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ ὥρα ὀγδόῃ· συνελήφθη ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Φιλίππου Τραλλιανοῦ, ἀνθυπατεύοντος Στρατίου Κοράτου.

According to the Paris MS. described as 'p,' it runs thus:—

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος μηνὸς Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρᾳ ἱσταμένου πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαίων σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ ὥρα ὀγδόῃ· συνελήφθη δὲ ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Φιλίππου Τραλλιανοῦ, ἀνθυπατεύοντος.

According to the Moscow MS. described as 'm,' it is as follows:—

Ἐμαρτύρησεν δὲ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος κατὰ μὲν Ἀσιανούς μῆνός Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρᾳ, κατὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίους πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαρτίων σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ· ὥρα ἐνύτη ἥ καὶ συνελήφθη ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου ἀρχιεραρχούτος μὲν Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀσεβούς Τραϊανῷ ἀνθυπατεύοντος δὲ Κοδράτου.

The Paschal Chronicle has the following notice, which is set out so far as it appears to be based upon the letter:—

Πολλοὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν ἐν οἷς Πολύκαρπος . . . συλληφθεὶς ἐπὶ ἀνθυπάρχου Τατίου Κοδριάντου ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου εἰρηνάρχου υἱοῦ οὗτος Νικήτου . . . τῇ πρὸ ζ' καλανδῶν Ἀπριλίων, τῷ μεγάλῳ σαββάτῳ ὥρα η'.

The old Latin version is as follows:—

Martyrium S. Polycarpi mense Aprilio vii Kal. Maias majore sabbato horâ octavâ; captus est ab Herode, Pontifice Philippo Trajano, Proconsule Statio Quadrato.²

There is one other passage bearing upon the question—the heading of the letter in the codex Baroccianus:—

Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπισκόπου Σμύρνης τῆς Ἀσίας πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Φεβρουαρίων.³

The passage as restored by Dr. Lightfoot is as follows:—

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος μηνὸς Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρᾳ ἱσταμένου πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαρτίων, σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ, ὥρα ὀγδόῃ· συνελήφθη ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Φιλίππου Τραλλιανοῦ, ἀνθυπατεύοντος Στατίου Κοδράτου.¹

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 552, 553.

² Bolland, *Acta Sanctorum*, January 26, ii. 692 seq.; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 660; vol. ii. sec. ii. p. 984.

³ *Ibid.* p. 940.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 983, 984.

The important point in restoring the passage for our present purpose is the name of the Roman month, and of secondary importance is the question whether the day of the Greek or rather Macedonian month was named. The name of the Roman month is important because, all the authorities being agreed as to the number of days before its Kalends on which the martyrdom took place, upon fixing the name of the Roman month, the day of the year is fixed precisely. And the naming of the Greek or Macedonian month cannot raise any difficulty, because in different cities different months went by the name of Zanthiens.¹ The Greek or Macedonian month would therefore have to be interpreted according to some calendar which would agree with the date as given by the Roman month. Though the Greek month therefore could occasion no difficulty, the day of the Greek month might occasion difficulty, hence the importance of determining whether it is or is not part of the text. We are only directly concerned with the text down to σαββάτῳ μεγάλῳ; the remaining words are important only as they may bear upon the foregoing. It must be noticed that if either April or May is taken as the Roman month, a possible date is given for Great Sabbath in the ordinary acceptance of the term, and the argument that that is the meaning of the term, and consequently that the letter is a forgery, is strengthened. If, however, March, or still more February, is taken as the name of the Roman month, then an impossible date, according at all events to orthodox usage, is given for Great Sabbath, and accordingly there is occasion for the argument that Great Sabbath could not have been intended in its ordinary sense. And the particular argument against the genuineness of the letter founded upon attributing such phraseology to the Quarta-deciman Smyrneans is so far weakened. We must not therefore be surprised to find that Dr. Lightfoot, who is a strenuous supporter of the genuineness of the letter, is also a strenuous supporter of the reading Μαρτίων. As Dr. Lightfoot was a critic of no mean learning and ability, it is fortunate that we have the opportunity of testing his restoration of this passage by certain rules which he has laid down himself. In his preface to his edition of the Smyranean letter he says as follows: 'The principles which must

¹ Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 678 n.

guide an editor in the construction of the text are simple and obvious; a reading found in Eusebius and any one other authority must as a rule be accepted; when Eusebius fails us, the coincidence of the Latin version with any one Greek MS. should commonly be regarded as decisive. Of the Greek MSS. themselves the general order in point of authority is m. b. p. v., but in individual cases the peculiarities of the several MSS. may require to be considered in estimating their relative values.¹ Elsewhere Dr. Lightfoot gives his reason for preferring m. over the other MSS. It is that its readings more generally agree with Eusebius.² This shows that it is based upon an ancient text, but being so based it may nevertheless have been subject to licentious alteration, and this is in fact the case with the Moscow MS. Speaking of the form the postscript takes in that MS. Dr. Lightfoot says: 'The scribe of the Moscow MS. has struck out the words *καθὼς δηλώσω ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς*, so as to make the document complete in itself; at the same time he adds a few sentences of his own relating to Polycarp.'³ It is obvious therefore that the Moscow MS., notwithstanding its ancient original, when it is unsupported by other documents, is an authority to be accepted with some caution.

To apply these principles to the determination of the text, we find that we have in favour of the reading *Μαίων* the two Greek MSS. b. and p. and the Latin version. Against it there is in favour of the reading *Μαπρίων* the Moscow MS., and of the reading *Ἀπριλίων* the 'Paschal Chronicle,' while the heading of b. would suggest the reading *Φεβρουαρίων*. There seems now no doubt at all that the weight of authority is in favour of *Μαίων*. It has that agreement of the Latin version with a Greek authority, in this case two Greek authorities, which on a point upon which Eusebius is silent, in accordance with Dr. Lightfoot's rule, should commonly be decisive. In favour of *Μαπρίων* there is only the Moscow MS. Now we have noticed the tendency to licentious alteration exhibited elsewhere in this MS. It is exhibited in a noticeable degree in this passage. In the few words we have quoted, quite apart from the change of *Μαίων* into *Μαπρίων*, there are no less than

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. sec. ii. p. 946.

² *Ibid.* p. 940.

³ *Ibid.* p. 1008.

four alterations which are certainly of this character, by which I mean alterations made intentionally and not proceeding from any misinterpretation of the exemplar before him by the scribe or editor or from carelessness on his part. Thus there are the insertion of the three phrases *κατὰ μὲν Ἀσιανούς, κατὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίους*, and *ταῦ ἀρεβούς*, and the change of *ὀγδόη* into *ἐνίτη*. There is also, though not so obviously of this character, the change of *Μαπρυεῖ* into *Ἐμαρτύρησεν*. Dr. Lightfoot has shown his opinion of these readings by rejecting all of them. It appears therefore that in the Moscow MS. the passage under consideration has been entirely rewritten. This alone would render any reading it contained very suspicious. The readings *Ἀπριλίων* and *Φεβρουαρίων*, not being supported by any MS. or version of the passage, scarcely enter into competition. We see therefore that the weight of authority is strongly in favour of the reading *Μαίων*. If we look to the context we see that this reading gives a possible day for Great Sabbath, which *Μαπρίων* does not. As we know from Eusebius as well as all the other authorities that the letter placed the martyrdom on Great Sabbath, we have here a strong confirmation of *Μαίων* as the proper reading.

We will now come to the reason of the reading *Μαπρίων*. This reading gives for the date of the martyrdom the twenty-third of February, which was one of the traditional days on which it was celebrated.¹ The Vienna MS. has interpolated this date into the body of the letter, and Dr. Lightfoot quotes this interpolation as a confirmation of the reading *Μαπρίων* in the passage we are considering which the Vienna MS. omits. But this does not seem the proper inference to draw. The editor of the Vienna MS., in omitting one section of the document and making an interpolation in another place, was clearly making an intentional change. Why, it may be asked, did he do this? The answer must be that it was his way of changing the date of the martyrdom. The reading *Φεβρουαρίων* in the heading of b. admits of a similar explanation. It gives the date of the martyrdom the twenty-sixth of January. Now the twenty-sixth of January was another traditional date for the martyrdom.² Dr. Lightfoot

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 660, 661.

² *Ibid.* 661.

argues that *Μαρτίων* was the original reading because it would explain the readings *Μαῖων* and *Ἀπριλίων, Μαῖων* as resulting from the accidental omission of two letters, and *Ἀπριλίων* in order to give a possible date for Great Sabbath. This argument as far as it goes is good, but it is nearly as easy to make *Μαρτίων* out of *Μαῖων* as vice versa, and if you once got both readings *Μαῖων* and *Μαρτίων*, *Ἀπριλίων* might be taken by the writer of the 'Paschal Chronicle' as a mean between them. But it must be noticed that vii. Kal. Maias or the 25th of April, though a possible, is a very late date for Great Sabbath. The 25th of April was a possible date for Easter as late as A.D. 387, when we learn from St. Ambrose that Easter was kept on that day by the Churches of Egypt.¹ It would, therefore, have been a possible date for Great Sabbath a century or more earlier, but the 'Paschal Chronicle' was about two centuries and a half later, in which time by the Julian calendar the equinox would have come nearly two days earlier. At that date, the 25th of April would probably have been too late a date for Great Sabbath, and this consideration might have induced the compiler of the chronicle to substitute April for May. We must notice also that Dr. Lightfoot has to argue that *Φεβρουαρίων* is a mistake for *Μαρτίων*. If this can be so, *Ἀπριλίων* may be a mistake for *Μαῖων*.

So far as we have gone the balance of probability seems altogether in favour of the reading *Μαῖων*, and if we adopt the reading of the Latin version *Mense Aprilio*, or *Μηνί Ξανθικοῦ*, there is nothing more to say against it. According to the form of the Macedonian calendar prevalent in Syria the months agreed with the Julian months, *Zanthicus* being equivalent to April,² and this seems to have been the meaning put upon the passage by the Latin translator; but according to the Greek MSS. the reading is not merely *μηνί Ξανθικοῦ* but *μηνὸς Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρα*, and upon this an argument can be raised which affects the Roman date. There were calendars in force in proconsular Asia based on the Julian calendar, but differing from it in the names and commencements of the months, each month commencing eight days before the month to which it most nearly corresponded in the Julian calendar. According to these calendars the *πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν*, or, as we should say, the sixth day before the Kalends, when it

had thirty days, would correspond with the third day of the Greek month, but in certain of these calendars when the month had thirty-one days it was reckoned as having two first days, so that which was really the third was called the second, thus making the month always end on the thirtieth day. In such cases only *πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν* corresponded with *δευτέρα*. If, therefore, *δευτέρα* is part of the text, the Greek month must be referred to one of these calendars. Now, the only one of these calendars which is known to contain the month *Zanthicus*, is a calendar known as the Ephesian, and according to this calendar *Zanthicus* commences eight days before the first of March.¹ *Ξανθικοῦ δευτέρα* will therefore correspond with *πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαρτίων*, and thus, assuming *δευτέρα* to be a part of the text, we get an argument in favour of the reading *Μαρτίων*. On the other hand, assuming *Μαῖων* to be the true reading, we get an argument for rejecting *δευτέρα* in favour of the reading of the Latin version. There is no improbability that the Latin version alone should preserve the original reading. The copyists of Latin versions generally copied them mechanically, while the Greek mind, being much more active, tended to introduce changes.

With a view of further sifting the matter it may be asked according to what calendar the date ought to be interpreted. If the letter is genuine, it must be answered, the calendar of Smyrna; if the letter is not genuine, it is difficult to say according to what calendar. It might be the calendar of Smyrna or any other that would be commonly understood. Now, according to the calendar of Smyrna the month which began eight days before the Kalends of March was called not *Zanthicus* but *Anthesierion*. We see, therefore, that, supposing the letter to be genuine, we do not here get any confirmation of the reading *Μαρτίων*. We do not know the name of the month which, according to the calendar of Smyrna, began eight days before the Kalends of May.²

Our knowledge of the calendar described as the Ephesian is derived from a MS. containing a number of calendars, which also contains the commentary of Theon upon Ptolemy, and which, therefore, must be after the days of Theodosius the Great.³

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 667.

² *Ibid.* 661 *et seq.*

³ This is the only indication of the date of the MS. I have seen, but I suppose it is not nearly so ancient.

¹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th edit. vol. vii. 'Easter.'

² *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 678 n¹.

The names of the months are Macedonian. When this calendar came into use in Ephesus is unknown. We have evidence that it was not in use A.D. 104; an inscription of Ephesus of that year making *πρὸ ἧ' καλανδῶν Μαρτίων* equivalent to *μηνὸς 'Ανθεστηριῶνος β'.*¹ This inscription shows that the calendar in force at Ephesus differed from the calendar in question in two points. The month had the Ionian name Anthesterion instead of the Macedonian name Zanthicus, and the days were counted regularly from the beginning instead of counting the second day of the month as the first. There is also an inscription of Smyrna referred to the age of the Antonines which would make *πρὸ πέντε καλανδῶν Εἰουνίων*, or, as Dr. Lightfoot conjectures, *Εἰουλίων*, equivalent to *'Εκατομβαιῶνος τετάρτη.*² Now again, Hecatombeon is not one of the names of the Macedonian months. There is, therefore, nothing to suggest that the calendar in question had come into use at Ephesus or Smyrna till long after the martyrdom of Polycarp or the writing of the letter we are considering. If, therefore, the reference to this calendar were part of the original text, it would suggest a very late origin for the letter, but we have seen it is probably not part of the original text but a subsequent alteration.

The probable history of the text is this. The original reading was that of the Latin version, *Μηνὶ Ξανθικοῦ πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν Μαΐων*; that this reading was rejected in favour of that of the Moscow MS. by some editor who wished to insert the traditional date of the martyrdom, and that the reading thus produced was mixed with the original reading, as we get it in MSS. b. and p. The great argument in favour of this conclusion is that undoubtedly the letter in its original form placed the martyrdom on Great Sabbath. No reasonable meaning can be given to Great Sabbath except the obvious one—the Saturday before Easter Sunday; and the letter in its original form must have contained a date consistent with this.

The writer of the letter was probably the person whom Dr. Lightfoot calls the false Pionius. He probably had before him, at the time he wrote it, the traditional date of the martyrdom, which he departed from to give way to his fancy of making the

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 665.

² *Ibid.* 666.

martyrdom take place on Great Sabbath, but the words *πρὸ ἑπτὰ καλανδῶν* were probably suggested by it. In a letter intended for general circulation he did not give the day of a Greek or Macedonian month, which would be intelligible in a limited locality only, but stated that the martyrdom took place in the month Zanthicus, which, in accordance with the most generally known form of the Macedonian calendar, was equivalent to April, in which sense we see it was taken by the Latin translator. It must be noticed also that Josephus, in his 'Antiquities,' takes Zanthicus as the equivalent of the Jewish month Nisan.

The letter shows a tendency to draw or make parallels between the martyrdom of Polycarp and the crucifixion of Jesus. In a genuine document it is not improbable that primitive Christians would more or less strain the facts to bring out such parallels. The existence of these parallels does not, therefore, appear very much to aid the argument against the genuineness of the letter. On the other hand, the letter has a verisimilitude about many parts of it which has been used as an affirmative argument of its genuineness. Most of the forgeries of the primitive Christians are so contemptible from a literary point of view, that it is not surprising that it should be rather taken as an axiom that no literary skill ought to be expected from the writer of a Christian document, but this inference is unfounded. It would be strange if such skill were not found now and then. Supposing the possibility of such skill, the presence of this apparent verisimilitude is no argument of the genuineness of the document that exhibits it; it shows merely the skill of the writer.

The writer of the Smyrnan letter had probably witnessed martyrdoms in the Decian persecution, and so was able to give a graphic picture of one. It may be asked why he did not describe the actual martyrdoms he had witnessed? This would not have answered his purpose; he wished to establish doctrines by putting them into the mouth of a famous man like Polycarp.

There are several ways in which the art of the writer of the letter is disclosed. Thus he takes his formal introduction and ending from the epistle of Clement of Rome, thus securing the ancient style.¹ Probably he guided himself in a similar way in

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii. vol. i. 610, 611.

other matters. Thus he may have taken the names of the proconsul and Asiarch from some inscription, and so secured the names of actual men who held office together. It must be noticed also that there are passages in the life which exhibit the same verisimilitude as the letter, particularly the account of the election and instalment of Polycarp, and this is produced, there can be little doubt, in the same way by the writer basing his narrative on similar scenes he had witnessed.

The proper conclusion, therefore, appears to be that the letter of the Smyrnæans is a forgery, and, that being so, the arguments of M. Waddington as to the date of the proconsulship of Statius Quadratus do not affect the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp; the only evidence we have of the latter date being the statement of Eusebius that it took place under Marcus Aurelius, a statement by no means certainly accurate, but of considerable probability.

All the evidence bearing upon the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp was collected by Dr. Lightfoot, the late bishop of Durham, in his 'Apostolic Fathers,' and the facts in the foregoing notice are all but entirely taken from that work (see especially the articles on the Letter of the Smyrnæans and the Date of the Martyrdom, 'Apostolic Fathers,' part II. vol. i. pages 588 to end). The article on the Early Roman Succession ('Apostolic Fathers,' part I. vol. i. page 201 *et seq.*) has also a considerable bearing upon the same topic. I must pay this tribute to the thoroughness with which the facts are set out in these articles, that they have enabled me to come to an entirely opposite conclusion to that which they were intended to support.

NOTE.—In the foregoing remarks I have thought it a sufficient answer to Dr. Lightfoot's theory that Great Sabbath should be taken to refer to a Jewish festival, that that view is not admissible on the language of the letter; in other words, if members of a religious sect write to members of the same sect, and refer to a religious festival absolutely without any qualification, such festival not being a public institution of the country, they must be taken as referring to a festival of their own sect, and not of another, and, as appears by the letter, bitterly hostile sect; for if they did otherwise, they would appear to adopt the festival as their own. But if this obvious objection be passed by, Dr. Lightfoot's theory does not, by any means, free the case from difficulties. The only Jewish festival he can suggest is the feast of Purim

which was celebrated at the full moon. Now it seems that Saturday, the 23rd of February, A.D. 155, was four or five days distant from the day of full moon. Mr. Turner has accordingly suggested that the year of the martyrdom should be taken as A.D. 156, and the letter to read the 8th before the Kalends of March, by which device he obtains as the date of the martyrdom the high Sabbath before Purim (see 'Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica,' vol. ii., Oxford, 1890, page 120). We see therefore that Dr. Lightfoot's theory requires the Jews to have been very careless as to the phases of the moon, and Mr. Turner's a conjectural amendment of the text in one of the few points in which all the authorities agree.

INDEX

- ANNOTT, Rev. E. A., D.D., as to Justin Martyr's quotations, 146 *et seq.*
- Acts in the time of Pontius Pilate, 179, 195, 200
- Adam, 99, 100
- Africanus, 99
- Ammonius, 98
- Anastasius of Sinai, notice of Papias by, 97, 98, 99, 245, 246
- Andrew or Andreas, Bishop of Caesarea, notices of Papias by, 31, 96, 100
- Anicetus, 119, 248, 249
- Apocalypse, cited by Papias, 31, 96, 127, 128
- Apollinarius, notice of Papias by, 93
- Apostle, meaning of name, 248
- Apostolic constitutions, 36
- Aquila, translator of O. T., 157, 161
- Aquinas, 74 n.
- Aramaic, gospels how far from, 133 *et seq.*
- Arethas, Bishop of Caesarea, 31
- Aristion, 9-13, 233, 234, 248
- BARNAHAS, 248
- Baroecianus codex, notice of Papias in, 22, 243-245
- Barsabas, called Justus, 22, 244, 245
- Bleek's analysis of O. T. quotations in gospels, 129 *et seq.*; similar phenomenon in Justin Martyr, vii
- CATENA of extracts used by Justin, 193, 197, 199, 204; used by Matthew and Luke, 199; used by fathers, 221
- Cerinthus, 119
- Clement of Alexandria as to gospels written first, 2; says that Mark wrote at Peter's request, 3 n.; as to first epistle of John, 37; not typical of his age, 70; contends that Christians are described as children, 102 *et seq.* See also 98
- Clement of Alexandria Paedagogus, bk. I. c. x., 101 *et seq.*
- Clement of Rome, death of, 6; MSS., 61; way of citing O. and N. T., 63; use of *λογιον* by, 58 *et seq.*; epistle of, 265
- Clement of Rome, first epistle, c. 13, 58, 60; c. 19, 58; c. 53, 59; c. 62, 59
- Clement of Rome, second epistle, use of *λογιον* in, 68 *et seq.*
- Clement of Rome, second epistle, date of, 70 *et seq.*; MSS., 72, 73; c. 13, 68; c. 17, 72
- Credner, viii
- Cyril, 96
- DAVIDSON S., D.D., as to O. T. quotations in the gospels, 130 *et seq.*

De Boor, 22
Dionysius the Areopagite, 100,
101, 104, 246
Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria,
36

ELEUTHERUS, 119, 249
Epiphanius, 252, 253
Eusebius, as to date of Papias, 1,
6-8; does not say Papias re-
ferred to canonical gospels, 3;
as to influence of Papias, 8;
remarks as to Papias, 232 *et*
seq.; as to Clement, 70. See
also 23, 99

FEUARDENTIUS, 214

GOSPEL quotations, sources of, vi
Gospels, canonical, originally an-
onymous, 2
— sources of, partly Aramaic,
partly Greek, 133 *et seq.*
Great Sabbath, martyrdom of
Polycarp on, 256, 266
Greek—gospels how far from?
133 *et seq.*
Gregory, 96, 98

HADRIAN, 22-26, 244, 245
Hamartolus, George, notice of
Papias by, 22, 242 *et seq.*
Hatch, E., D.D., 183, 232, 236
Herodes Atticus, 7
Hilgenfeld supposes spurious
works of Papias, 16
Hippolytus, 96

IONATIAN epistles, 77
Irenaeus, notices of Papias by, 8,
105 *et seq.*; confounds John the
elder with the apostle, 13, 33
et seq.; in advance of his age,
70, 80; considered O. T. the
words of Christ, 85, 86; as to
millennium, 105 *et seq.*; elders
mentioned by, 115 *et seq.*; cites

non-existent prophecy as from
Jeremiah, 210 *et seq.* See also
96, 99

Irenaeus, against heresies:
bk. iii. c. 3, s. 4, 118; bk. iv.
c. 2, s. 3, 85; bk. iv. c. 27, 120
et seq.; bk. iv. c. 28, 123; bk. iv.
c. 30, 123; bk. iv. c. 32, 124; bk.
v. c. 5, s. 1, 120, 124; bk. v. c. 33,
105 *et seq.*; bk. v. c. 36, 116;
bk. v. How far from Papias?
108 *et seq.*

Isaac means a child, 103, 104

JEROME, notices of Papias by,
126, 127

Jesus lived to beyond forty or
fifty, 14; notices of by Papias,
90, 106 *et seq.*, 234; life inter-
esting to primitive Christians
only as fulfilment of prophecy,
83 *et seq.*; date of crucifixion
of, 236 *et seq.*

John, Apostle, martyrdom of un-
known to Irenaeus, 19; Euse-
bius, Lightfoot, Salmon as to,
23, 24; said to be plunged in
boiling oil, 26, 27; died when?
28, 29

— the disciple of the lord men-
tioned by Irenaeus, 33; in
Muratorian fragment, 35

— the elder, mention of by Papias,
9-12; alive when Papias wrote,
12; confounded by Irenaeus
with the apostle, 13; discussion
as to, 33 *et seq.*; conclusions
to, 43. See also 233, 248

— first epistle of, cited by
Papias, 31, 235; second and
third epistles, authorship dis-
cussed, 36 *et seq.*

Josephus, use of *λόγιον* by, 55
— Jewish war, bk. vi. c. v., 4,
56. See also 126

Judas, death of, 93-96

Justin Martyr, Gospel quotations
of, vi; O. T. quotations of, vii;
use of *λόγιον* by, 64, 65; Hexae-

meron attributed, 99; quota-
tions assimilated to LXX, 147,
183; agreement with Protevan-
gelium, 166, 167, 170 *et seq.*;
quoted O. T. from written
sources not LXX, 203; used
catena of extracts, 193, 197,
199, 202; charges Jews with
mutilating LXX, 206 *et seq.*
Justin Martyr, 1 Ap. c. 32, 61,
185; c. 33, 148, 150-167; c. 34,
148, 168; c. 35, 148, 176, 178,
189; c. 41, 217; c. 47, 190; c.
48, 194; Dial. c. 16, 193; c. 18,
65; c. 43, 148, 151 *et seq.*; c. 53,
148, 175; c. 55, 218; c. 66, 148,
151 *et seq.*; c. 67, 148; c. 68,
118; c. 71, 148, 206; c. 73, 218;
c. 77, 169; c. 78, 148, 170 *et seq.*;
c. 81, 35; c. 84, 148; c. 123,
148, 181; c. 135, 148, 181; De
Res. c. 4, 195; Cohortatio, c.
13, 164

Justus, Bishop of Jerusalem, 7

KEIM, 237, 241

Kircher's concordance, 49

LACTANTIUS cites prophecy as from
Esdras, 208 *et seq.*

Lightfoot, J. B., D.D., exploded
martyrdom of Papias, 6; as to
date of Papias, 12; contends
Papias was acquainted with the
fourth gospel, 17; rejects mar-
tyrdom of John, 23; as to epis-
tle of Polycarp, 68; as to date
of 2 Clement 70; as to style of
quoting N. T. in the second
century, 77 *et seq.*; reading in
2 Clement xvii. 73; Luke
prologue, 84 n.; date of Ani-
cetus, 249; date of Polycarp's
martyrdom, 248; authorship
of Life of Polycarp, 250 *et seq.*;
reading in Smyranean letter,
258 *et seq.*

λόγια, meaning of, 5; discussed,
48; used by Papias in one
sense, 4

λόγια κυριακά, meaning Messianic
prophecies, applicable to Pa-
pias, 89, 91 *et seq.*

λόγιον, meaning of in LXX, 49
— places in which found in
LXX, 227

— meaning of in Philo Judaeus,
50 *et seq.*; in N. T., 54, 55; in
Josephus, 55 *et seq.*; in Clement
of Rome, 58 *et seq.*; in Justin
Martyr, 64, 65; in Epistle of
Polycarp, 66 *et seq.*; in 2 Cle-
ment, 68 *et seq.*

— development in meanings of,
75
— summary of authorities as to,
76

— Latin renderings of, 80, 81

— sense in which used by Papias,
82 *et seq.*; differences as to,
not of meaning but intendment,
86; meaning inspired sayings
of the Lord, how applicable to
Papias, 86 *et seq.*; meaning
inspired narrative about the
Lord, how applicable to Papias,
86 *et seq.*; meaning history, 89

Λόγιον or *λόγιον*, readings of Euse-
bius discussed, 45

Lyons and Vienna, letter of
churches of, 20

MACARIUS MAGNES, 250

Malalas, John, use of Papias by,
99, 100, 246

Marinimus, mother of, 22, 25

Mureion, 16, 119

Marcus Aurelius, 248, 266

Mark, book by noticed by Papias,
83; said by Papias not to have
acted wrongly, 225; said by
Papias to have written without
order, 225; remarks of Papias
as to discussed, 225; — and
Luke omitted O. T. quotations
from Hebrew, 140

Martyr contrasted with confessor,
20

Matthew, work attributed to by

- Papias, a work on Messianic prophecies, 1, 83
 Matthew, book by, noticed by Papias, 1, 83
 Maximilla, 253
 Maximus Confessor, Notice of Papias by, 100, 105, 246, 247
 Melito, 85
 Millennium, 105 *et seq.*
 Messianic prophecies common to Matthew and Justin Martyr, 138 *et seq.*
 Messianic prophecies in Justin Martyr not found in Matthew, 185 *et seq.*
 — not found in canonical books, 206 *et seq.*
 — secondary authority on, used by fathers, 221
 Methodius, 96
 Montanists, 251 *et seq.*
 Muratorian fragment as to epistles of John, 38 *et seq.*
 — date of, 41
 NEW TESTAMENT, style of quoting in 2nd century, 77
 — passages from discussed:
 — Matthew i. 23, quotation in; whether from LXX, 131, 150 *et seq.*; ii. 6, 132, 167; ii. 18, 149; iv. 10, 138; xi. 5, 198; xii. 13-21, 141, 148, 181; xv. 1-9, 138; xxii. 24, 132; xxvi. 64, 136
 — Mark i. 2, 132; iii. 6-12, 141
 — Luke prologue, 84 n.
 — vii. 22, 198
 — Acts vii. 38, 54; viii. 35, 84; xvii. 11, 84; xviii. 28, 84; xxvi. 22, 23, 84
 — Romans iii. 2, 55
 — Hebrews v. 12, 55
 — 1 Peter i. 9 *et seq.*, 84; iii. 18, 214; iv. 6, 214; iv. 11, 55
 — Apocalypse xii. 9, cited by Papias, 96

OLD TESTAMENT, quotations from, in Gospels, 129 *et seq.*; omitted by Mark, 141; by Luke, 200

- Old Testament, passages from, discussed:
 — Exodus, xvi. 19, 53
 — Numbers, xvi. 28, 38, 54; xxiv. 17, quoted by Justin as from Isaiah, 64, 185 *et seq.*; quoted by Irenaeus, 186
 — Deuteronomy, vi. 13, 138
 — 1 Chronicles, xvi. 23-31, 217
 — Psalm xix. 14, 49; xxiv. 7, 8, quoted by Justin, 201 *et seq.*; lxix. 23, 96; cix. 18, 96; cxix. 49
 — Isaiah, i. 7, quoted by Justin, 191; ix. 6, quoted by Justin, 189; vii. 10-16, quoted by Justin, 152 *et seq.*; quoted by Tertullian, 156; vii. 14, according to Aquila Symmachus and Theodotion, 157; readings of LXX, 158; quoted by Justin and Matthew, 148 *et seq.*, 159 *et seq.*; context of Justin's quotation, 165 *et seq.*; xxviii. 13, 14, 49; xxxv. quoted by Justin, 195; xlii. 1-4, quoted by Justin and Matthew, 181; quotations and renderings of, 230 *et seq.*; lxvi. 2, 60
 — Jeremiah, xxxi. 15, quoted by Justin and Matthew, 148, 149; context of Justin's quotation, 168; i. 3, quoted by Justin as from Isaiah, 191
 — Ezekiel, xlii. 15 to xliii. 3, 56
 — Daniel, vii. 13, quoted by Justin as from Jeremiah, 202
 — Micah, v. 2, quoted by Justin and Matthew, 148, 149; context of Justin's quotation, 167

- Old Testament, Zechariah, ix. 9, quoted by Justin and Matthew, 148, 149; quoted by Justin, 1 Ap., 173 *et seq.*; context of quotation, 174 *et seq.*; quoted by Justin, Dial., 179 *et seq.*; according to Hexapla, 181
 — Malachi, iii. 3, 140
 Origen, as to Epistles of John, 37.
 See also 243
 Overbeck, 16

PALEY thought Papias referred to the first and second canonical gospels, 2

Pantacenus, 98

Papias, wrote on Messianic prophecies, v; title of his book, 1, 82; reference to Matthew, 1, 83; reference to Mark, 2, 83; date of, 1, 6 *et seq.*, 31; statements inapplicable to first and second canonical gospels, 3, 4; martyrdom of, exploded, 6; bishop of Hierapolis, 7; notice of, by Irenaeus, 8, 105 *et seq.*; influence of, 8; citation from, by Eusebius, 9; not a hearer of the Apostles, 12; wrote after the deaths of the Apostles, 12; wrote in lifetime of John the Elder and Aristion, 11 *et seq.*; notice of, in Vatican MS., 16; 'in exotericis,' meaning of, 16-18; said to have written fourth gospel at dictation of John, 16-19; supposed spurious books of, 16; notice of, in catena, by B. Corder, 18; notice of, in 'Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae,' 22; said John was killed by the Jews, 22, 23; did not say that those raised by Christ lived till Hadrian, 25; anterior limit to date of his work, 27 *et seq.*; cites first epistle of Peter, 31;

cites Apocalypse, 31, 93; use of λόγιον by, 82 *et seq.*; disparaged by Eusebius, 90; did not use canonical gospels, 90; why his books were lost, 90; summary of conclusions, 91; why distrusted books, 92; did not name Paul, 93; notice of, by Apollinarius, 93; notice of by Oecumenius, 94; notice of, by Andreas, 96; use of, by Malalas, 100; notices of, by Anastasius of Sinai, 98, 99; notices of, by Maximus Confessor, 100, 105; probability of his mentioning matter to be found in the canonical gospels, 114, 115; notice of, by Jerome, 126; notice of, interpolated in Eusebius, 127

Papyrus mistaken for Papias, 6
 Peshito-Syriac version, 41-43
 Peter, first epistle of, cited by Papias, 31, 235

Philip, daughters of, 11, 22, 233
 Philip of Side, 22

Philo Judaeus, meaning of λόγιον in, 50 *et seq.*; author of De Vita Contemplativa, 227 *et seq.*
 See also 104

Philo Judaeus, Meeting for seeking knowledge, c. 24, 51; Fugitives, c. 11, 51; Life of Moses, l. c. 15, 53; III. c. 21, 50; c. 23, 51; c. 35, 53; c. 36, 53; c. 38, 54; De Decalogo title, 52; De specialibus legibus sextum, etc title, c. 1, 2, 52; Howards and punishments, c. 1, 51; Nobility, c. 5, 50; Contemplative life, c. 3, 52

Philosophumena, 253

Pionius, reputed author of Life of Polycarp, 250

Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, 7; notice of, by Irenaeus, 118 *et seq.*; visit to Rome, 118 *et seq.*; taught by apostles, etc., 247; date of martyrdom, 247;

- miracles attributed to, 250;
death of, 254
Polycarp, epistle of, 78; date of,
68; use of *λόγιον* in, 66
Polycarp, epistle of, c. 7, 66
Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus,
says John was a martyr, 19;
weight of his statement, 20
et seq.
Pothinus, 125
Primus, Bishop of Alexandria, 7
Protevangelium, 173 n.; agree-
ment of Justin with, 166, 170
et seq.
QUADRATUS, apology of, 25, 26
Quadratus Statius, 249, 258, 266
Quartodeciman controversy, 251
Quotations from O. T. from the
Hebrew, omitted by Mark and
Luke, 140 *et seq.*; from O. T. in
gospels follow LXX where it
differs from the Hebrew, 138;
of Justin Martyr assimilated to
LXX, 147, 183
READING of Eusebius, *λογίων* and
λόγων, 4, 45 *et seq.*; of Clement
of Rome, 60 *et seq.*; of II. Cle-
ment, 72, 73; of Smyranean
letter, 258 *et seq.*
Rebecca means patience, 103, 104
Redeemed will witness with
pleasure the sufferings of the
lost, 74
Richter, 50
Rufinus, 81
SAOARIS, a martyr, 19
Salmon, rejects martyrdom of
John, 23; as to date of Murato-
rian fragment, 41; as to O. T.
quotations in gospels, 133 n.;
as to John the Elder, 15 n
Sandy, as to mixed quotations,
vi n.
Scillitan martyrs, acts of, 78
Septuagint, meaning of *λόγιον* in,
49; origin of, as told by early
Christians, 164
Smyræana, letter of, 249; post-
script to, 253; a forgery, 254;
miracles in, 254; readings in,
255 *et seq.*, 257 *et seq.*
Soter, 119
Strauss, as to death of Judas, 96
Supernatural religion (book
called), v
Symeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, 7;
authorities as to his martyr-
dom, 7
Symmachus (translator of O. T.
into Greek), 157, 161
TERTULLIAN, as to attempted mar-
tyrdom of John, 26, 27; mixed
citation from Isaiah, 156; cites
words 'a ligno' as from Psalm,
219
Theodotion (translator of O. T.
into Greek), 157, 161
Thraseas, a martyr, 19
Torner, C. H., date of Polycarp's
martyrdom, 267
VALENTINIANISM, 71
Valentinus, 71, 118
Vossian codex of Irenæus, 186
Vulgate, Ezekiel xliii. 3, 57
WADDINGTON, as to date of
Symeon's martyrdom, 7; as to
date of Polycarp's martyrdom,
249
Westcott (Bishop), as to date of
Papias, 12; contends that
Papias knew the fourth gospel,
17; as to O. T. quotations in
gospels, 128
Woman taken in adultery, story
not from Papias, 235
ZANTHICUS, Macedonian month,
259 *et seq.*



